THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VIII APRIL, 1924 No. 46

EDITORIAL

THE CHURCH AND NATIONAL LIFE

*Studies in the Christian Gospel for Society** is one of the many books in which the Student Movement endeavours to stimulate interest among its members in the social implicates of Christianity, and so enable them to play a useful part in the citizenship of the future. The parent of this literary stock was, perhaps, Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question;* and, on the whole, it has been more prolific in America than on this side of the Atlantic. The type is clear. There is the summary of our Lord's teaching as exemplified especially in the Sermon on the Mount; the presentation of the Kingdom of God as regulative for the Christian social ideal; and the application of the principles so traced out to politics and industry, family life, education, and so forth. The book before us is true to type; and it is so good of its kind that it is worth considering whether the kind is such as may give any deep or permanent help to the Church or to the world. Moreover, the gathering of C.O.P.E.C. this month makes the subject opportune.

"To the Church or to the world." We stumble at the outset upon a discrimination vital to the New Testament and to Catholic Christianity which we could wish had more meaning for the outlook we are considering. It must make all the difference whether we regard society in the first instance as something to be regarded as a fair field for the energies of idealists and doctrinaires, or as something above all to be interpenetrated and transfigured by what is itself another society. If it be true that God has taken our manhood upon Him and exalted it to the heavenly places in Christ; that He has caused to emerge in human history a Body which is supremely His Body, in-

* By H. A. Mess. Student Christian Movement, 1923. 6s net.

formed by His Spirit and nourished by His Life; then, manifestly, that is the most important fact with which any Christian sociology can start. The essence of the Christian Gospel for Society, as the Church conceives it, is the offer, not of a doctrine or set of principles, but of a concrete and historical social life, with its own scale of values (often dimmed, but always renascent); its own methods of co-operation in family, school, and business; its own continuous growth. For us the Kingdom of Heaven is not, in the first instance, a civic ideal. It is, in the first instance, an actual, present fact; a Divine social order embodied, really, though not exhaustively, in the Catholic Church. And the first interest of the Churchman in his outlook upon society is the preservation of the identity and the integrity of the Church as being pre-eminently the "Way" for the redemption of mankind.

This dominant interest inevitably determines the proportion in which we envisage what are commonly called the social problems of the day. We should sum up these problems under four main heads—viz., (1) Population, (2) Education, (3) Environment, (4) Government. None of these can be isolated from the others; but classification is inevitable, if we are to see our path at all. We put population first, because the most fundamental instinct in the common mind of the Church is that it is going to continue. Various ideas as to the world's future and end have been held at different times in Christian history, from that of a *millenium* realized on earth to that of a complete destruction of the earth and the salvation of believers in some other order of existence; but the one possibility which we may say that the Church has never entertained is that it might itself *die out*, as it would if mankind ceased to propagate his species. Education, again, is obviously bound up with the ends of a society which exists to continue the work of One who came "that they might have life, and have it abundantly"; and, as Plato realized long ago, it is closely connected with environment or the social conditions of the people. Finally, since the Church is a *civitas* with its own government, it cannot be, and history shows that it never has been, indifferent to the forms of secular government which surround it at any time, nor to the civil laws under which its members live.

---

1. Population.

There can be no question but that the instinct of the Church, whether judged by the utterances of authority, or by the teaching of theologians, or by the numerous delicate influences

which in her pastoral work she brings to bear on the homes of her people, makes for increase of the race, and is opposed to any fashions which may lead to sterility. Whether we go to civilized France or to half-savage Melanesia, it is the Christian parts of the population which stand outside the otherwise prevalent current of race-suicide. Against such a mass instinct the arguments of the Aristogenists, as we may term the extreme Eugenists who advocate scientific breeding, are powerless. This is not to say that the Church would oppose restrictions upon marriage, where marriage will mean the transmission of disease; and, in fact, religion provides one of the strongest supports to such as feel bound to "make themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake." But with the policy of Aristogeny as a whole the Church can come to no terms, for the simple reason that it regards character as the basis of the happy State, and believes character to depend not on heredity so much as on those manifold spiritual influences which we call the grace of God and their acceptance by the will.

This urge towards increase in population brings us up at once against the Malthusian dilemma, the pressure of population upon the means of subsistence; and, as Mr. Mess points out, the dilemma is acute in a country like our own. The point is one of the main planks in the platform of those Eugenists who advocate Birth Control. With much that is said in favour of the prudent spacing of children, on the grounds both of health and of economy, intelligent people will sympathize; and opinions differ as to whether or not there are special cases where methods of preventing conception (other than that of continence) may be allowed. But the Church can never for a moment admit this policy as a way out of the Malthusian dilemma. Spiritual considerations apart—and they are, in fact, very weighty—the policy is demonstrably a boomerang. It proves itself, as every parish priest can tell from his pastoral experience, to be simply a poisoned present (like Deïaneira's robe) made by society to its most selfish and individualistic elements, and to cause infinitely greater and longer-lasting misery in many homes than is caused by too large a family.

Nevertheless, the dilemma remains. What can the Church say? In the first place, it can enlist the support of all those who love life in urging the Eugenists to direct their abilities to problems of food-supply and diet. There is no reason whatever to suppose that we have reached the limits of human ingenuity in the adaptation of demand and supply. It is even probable that we eat both unwisely and too well. In the second place—and here the Church has perhaps a more direct contribution to make—we have no business to sit down under the notion that

the present distribution of population is final and irreformable, while vast areas of the earth are still unconquered by man. What is needed is the impulse to go and conquer them; in other words, a resumption of the habit of Migration. No habit is, in fact, more endemic in the human race: witness the Achæans, the Phœnicians, the Nordic races. And a religion which begins its story with Abraham and Joseph, which contains the records of the Dutch colonies in Africa, of the Roman Catholics in Maryland, and of the Pilgrim Fathers, can claim to be no stranger to Migration. Under modern conditions, perhaps nothing but the bond and impulse of religion could stimulate migratory enterprise on a scale and over a period sufficient to relieve congestion. The day is past when those who find the net of religious convention intolerable can simply form another schism. May it be that perhaps the Anglo-Catholic Movement may give birth to a new kind of Pilgrim Fathers going out to tenant the open prairies of Canada or the rich fields and hills of New Zealand?

---

2. Education.

In the last session of the Church Assembly the Bishop of Manchester quoted an illuminating statement of Sir Michael Sadler's on the subject of Education, which takes us at once to first principles. It turned on the distinction between two conceptions of Education—that which regards it as an *initiation* and that which regards it as *illumination*. On the latter view, the primary element in Education is instruction or the imparting of knowledge. This idea is comparatively modern, and derives from the French Revolution and its associated movements. And it is in marked contrast to the older view which regards Education first and foremost as an initiation into a social life, with all that that implies of tradition, atmosphere, and tone. As Sir James Barrie has recently said of its fruits: "This mysterious something is got with no effort. You just become enrolled a member of that school, and gradually you acquire the something." The two strands of practice and theory inevitably intertwine, and neither is complete without the other. But the question as to where the stress lies is fundamental. The Church, with its emphasis on the social aspect of religion, inclines heavily to the older view; and its constructive work in the foundation of Universities, Colleges, and Schools shows how constantly it has followed out its belief. We reckon under the idea of Education not only the classroom, but also the Chapel, the dormitory, the playing-field, and the Hall. At bottom the Church Schools stand for as much of

this system as is possible on a national scale—as much, that is to say, as is compatible with day-school conditions.

The upshot of this view will be twofold. On the one hand it will mean an attempt, not to bargain our schools for some advantage elsewhere, but to regroup them so that, as far as possible, there may be no populous area where the children of the Church cannot find a Church school to grow up in. Our first interest is in the formation of strong centres of Christian atmosphere, such as can only be secured by denominational connection. It will not be a far cry from that position, once established, to such a strengthening and organization of the religious elements in other schools as will raise the whole spiritual tone of national education. That first. On the other hand, we need a far greater interest among Church-people as a whole in educational progress. No village can feel itself complete without a playing-field for its young people. No managers should be content to let the walls of their schools be covered with cheap and second-rate pictures bought in the 'seventies, when admirable prints of Greek art and architecture, and of Italian and English painting, are so easily available. And we must be the first to press that staffs and accommodation shall be adequate to the numbers of children.

---

3. Environment.

We mean by this term the general conditions of the people's life—housing, wages, clothes and food, employment, amusements, etc. It is clearly closely bound up with Education. What is the good, it may be asked, of our teachers in our schools trying to—

> trace out the nature of the fair and the graceful, that our young men, dwelling as it were in a healthful region, may drink in good from every quarter, whence any emanation from noble works may strike upon their eye or their ear, like a gale wafting health from salubrious lands, and win them imperceptibly from their earliest childhood into resemblance, love, and harmony, with the true beauty of reason . . .*

what is the good of that, we may ask, if the young spend their life out of school in conditions of squalor, ugliness, and shame? There is, indeed, use in it; for the soul has an inner life that can rise above its environment. Yet we cannot rest content with the paradox; and there has never been a time, when the Church was alive to its great mission, without persistent effort to better the conditions of life.

And the root issue at the bottom of all social amelioration of this kind is that of Finance. Perhaps the most serious

* Plato, *Republic*, 401.

criticism against Mr. Mess's book, and the whole library of which it is a type, is that this issue is wholly ignored. Yet everyone knows that, when men come to make reforms—whether in the State, the municipality, or even the village—the main difficulty they have to deal with is that of Finance. How are the reforms to be paid for? And by whom?

Now it is commonly said that Finance is no business of the Church, except so far as its own funds are concerned. We believe that attitude of mind to be mistaken; and for this reason. Few to-day would deny the statement that our whole financial and economic fabric is built up upon credit, which facilitates exchange and enables production to keep ahead of use. And credit emphatically has its moral and spiritual side. It means a certain estimate or judgment of human character, present and prospective.

Credit, it has been said, is "the exchange of present goods for future goods." It relies, therefore, on the belief that those future goods will materialize; and this belief, though founded partly on calculations of a material order—as to harvests, permanence of supply, open means of transit, etc.—rests equally, or even more, on moral and political considerations of good faith, equity, and peace. In other words, credit depends on knowing what people will do.

As Professor Foakes Jackson has pointed out, the Christian Church at a very early stage of its career afforded a striking example of how a powerful religious impulse can affect the working of credit. We must not suppose that the converts who sold their real estate and brought the purchase money to lay at the Apostles' feet were simply carried away by blind frenzy or were reckoning that the imminent end of the world rendered provision for livelihood already wholly unnecessary. Rather, they counted on the willingness of the Church in its flaming spirit of brotherhood to "see them through," whatever might betide. And the event showed that they were not entirely mistaken; for when, as was inevitable, the Jerusalem Church found itself saddled with a crushing number of "poor saints," St. Paul made it one of his main businesses to collect alms for them in the Gentile Churches. We do not know how far this heroic makeshift met the case, nor is the action which made it necessary one to be followed as a precedent. Nevertheless, the incident indicates what has been proved abundantly true in the Church's history—that the Church is a fellowship, not of faith only, but also of good faith and practical credit. Broadly speaking, we know how our fellow-members

will act: we have common ideas of welfare, and a common determination to support one another in prosecuting their achievement.

The great contribution, therefore, which the Church can make to social amelioration, so far as that hinges upon finance, is the fact that it is a home of credit. When Samuel Butler wrote his chapters in *Erewhon* on "Musical Banks," the irony of this title for the churches in that Utopia contained more truth than perhaps he would have allowed. The point of truth lies not in the hymns nor in the collections: it lies in the reliability of character—good-will, equity, the spirit of sharing, the common vision and objective which are nourished in those who worship one Father, acknowledge one Lord, and participate in one Spirit and Body. No factor can be more important than this in the social reconstruction of a country. Few would deny that the promotion of welfare to-day necessitates on a large scale the redistribution of wealth as means to the end. The danger is that such redistribution may damage credit, and so defeat its purpose. The function of the Church, as we conceive it, is to keep the end steadily before the public mind, and to insist that its achievement is practicable. Naturally the Church cannot lend its countenance to schemes of welfare which are out of harmony with its own scale of values: that would be treason, and treason (to say nothing more) ruins credit. It could not, for instance, support schemes which would discourage the qualities of initiative, energy, or self-discipline, which are as necessary to the heavenly citizenship as to the earthly. But, once satisfied on this score, nothing should make it shy of even the boldest and most far-reaching measures of reform. Even a Capital Levy (supposing experts found it to be practicable) need not shake credit, provided that there were adequate guarantee in the national character that a promise of non-recurrence would be kept.

---

4. Government.

One of the strongest claims made on behalf of the Labour Party body is that it is part of an international organization. The claim is to some extent neutralized by the fact that this organization is economically on a class basis, and that Capital is virtually excluded. But a far stronger claim to function internationally can be made on behalf of the Christian Church. It is not an accident that the Austrian Prime Minister, who negotiated the Reconstruction Loan with the League of Nations,

was a priest; or that the stablest element in Germany to-day is the Catholic "Centrum." Rather it was the natural corollary of the historic part which the Church has played in the promotion of European solidarity. And that past portends a future. The genius of medieval Christendom lay not so much in its achievement as in its efforts to provide politics, government, and commerce with an ideal motive, and to make them activities in the sphere of grace as well as in that of nature. We may expect that the recovered sense of Catholicity, which the Reunion movement is fostering in every Christian Communion to-day, will prove of great assistance in the reconstruction of international life.

In a highly compact single State like that of Great Britain, the relations of Church and State are of even more obvious consequence, whether or not that of "establishment" be included in their number. The notion that our Lord's deeds and words somehow favour democracy as against other forms of government—a notion common in America, and echoed in Mr. Mess's book—may be dismissed as a figment of the imagination; but there is no reason to suppose that the Church finds democracy uncongenial to its work and witness. The expansion of the Church of England in the last century suggests that it is not so. But this very fact raises a whole host of difficult questions. How far, for example, are we entitled, and how far do we desire, to enforce Christian standards of conduct by law? What is our theory of punishment? Does Christian public opinion compromise itself if it endeavours to use the law for regulating what it would prefer (if it were possible) to suppress?

This last question has been before us in an acute form recently in connection with a betting tax. The question is one of a type of questions which range from the right way to combat venereal disease to the prevention of drunkenness. It is often said, for example, that the taxation of bets is analogous to the licensing of houses of ill-fame; and that in either case the State, by regulating vice, will appear to sanction it. The argument turns on the belief that betting is a vice in the same sense as fornication. Some people, perhaps, would even defend such a belief. But we are convinced that the opinion of Church-people generally would never endorse it for a moment. No Christian could ever doubt that sexual promiscuity was vicious; but many have doubted whether betting was always wrong, and are inclined rather to the opinion that it "is not in itself a sin, but may easily become one."

"Betting," said Archbishop Whately, "is a breach of the Tenth Commandment." In other words, it is a manifestation of covetousness. As a definition in morals, that is perhaps as near the mark as we shall get. But it is not merely covetousness: it is covetousness coloured by a love of risk, of danger even. What makes betting "a mug's game," as the Parliamentary Committee called it, is that the element of covetousness tends to predominate, and that it exercises itself in conditions where degradation is easy. No law can cure covetousness, which is a universal malady of the heart. But law can to a considerable extent affect the conditions of its operation, limiting its self-destructiveness, ruling out some of its squalid associations, and reducing its collateral mischiefs of secrecy and fraud. We are informed on good authority that this is what has happened in New Zealand through the introduction of the totalizator. It is true that betting has not decreased: perhaps the actual number of people who bet has been increased. But the tout and the bookie have gone; only cash bets can be made, and they can be made only on the course; and many of the most disastrous results of betting have been done away. Moreover, the State makes a handsome revenue from this source, which is, in effect, a tax on luxury.

We agree with those who feel that a tax on bets, which left the bookie and the tout in their present position, would be useless, and possibly harmful; but we are equally clear that a system which abolished those monstrosities, as well as benefiting the Exchequer, deserves very careful consideration. The present attitude of acquiescence in legal restrictions which everyone knows to be ineffective is a counsel of despair; and we should like to see a more resolute endeavour in the Church to tackle this gigantic evil. The case is parallel, not with the State regulation of vice, but with temperance legislation. By licensing the sale of liquor, the State recognizes it; and alcohol, like the race-course, may be an occasion of evil. Nevertheless, experience has shown that, though the amount of liquor consumed per head may not have diminished, many of its dangerous effects have been reduced by legislation. Moreover, the way has been prepared for the next step, which is the reform of the inn, by transforming it into a public service, and making it a place where decent folk will be glad to go for refreshment and social intercourse. Need we suppose that similar improvement in regard to the race-course is beyond the bounds of possibility?

SOME RECENT DISCOVERIES IN BABYLONIAN LITERATURE

IV.—THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF BÊL

The Babylonians celebrated the New Year with a long festival and elaborate religious ceremonies lasting the first eleven days of the month of Nisan. Fragments of the ritual followed on this occasion, together with the prayers and hymns then used, have been from time to time recovered, and enough has been already deciphered to show the general nature of the celebration. But, among many other important documents recovered by the Germans during their excavations at Ashshur, the capital of the northern or Assyrian kingdom, several tablets were found which proved that the Assyrians inaugurated the New Year similarly to their southern neighbours. One of these tablets, however, far surpasses the others in general interest; for it proves that the ritual was woven round a myth concerning the death and resurrection of the god, in which there were striking resemblances to the accounts of Christ's Passion as handed down by the Evangelists. The tablet, which has been published in cuneiform by Dr. Ebeling in his *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur Religiösen Inhalts*, No. 143, and edited by Professor Zimmern in a pamphlet entitled *Zum babylonischen Neujahrsfest*, pp. 3-21, and again by Professor Langdon in his recent work, *The Babylonian Epic of Creation*, pp. 32-51, has unfortunately suffered considerable damage. But its somewhat poor state of preservation is not the only cause of difficulty in arriving at its meaning; several of the words bear doubtful, if not unknown, senses, and in many places commentary and text are almost inextricably interwoven. The text as we have it must be assigned roughly to the eighth century B.C.; but the subject is, of course, much older, as is probably also much of the material embodied in the commentary which accompanies it. The text is of such importance that it seems preferable, imperfect though it is in many places, to give as complete an account of it as possible.

The opening line runs:

"... That is, Bêl, who was imprisoned in the Mountain" (1).

In other words, only the commentary, introduced by the words "that is," has survived. The "mountain" is the mountain of the world, within which the Babylonians supposed that the dead were assembled. Bêl is then brought forth from the place of the dead (3) and questioned in "a house on the

edge of the Mountain " (7). Then the god Nebo, his son, comes from Borsippa to enquire after his father, who is held captive (8), a passage which reflects the bringing of the statue of Nebo from Borsippa to Babylon for the New Year's Feast; as a symbol of this, a celebrant rides hastily to some kind of tomb (4-7). The city is thrown into confusion, and the people rush to and fro in the streets seeking Bêl and crying out: " Where is Bêl ?" (9); his consort Zarpânit, represented by a priestess, stretches out her hands in prayer to the gods Sin and Shamash, saying, " Restore Bêl to life," (10), and, her prayer remaining unanswered, approaches the gate of the grave looking for him (11). According to the legend, Bêl's body was supposed to lie embalmed in the grave, while his soul dwelt beneath the mountain awaiting the day of its resurrection. Stories of this grave were current among the Greeks; Aelian, for example, tells how Xerxes had it opened, and found the god's body lying in it, bathed in oil, but not decomposed. There twin watchmen keep watch over the grave, represented by two watchmen posted at the door of Bêl's temple, Esagila:

" Twins who stand at the gate of Esagila—these are his guardians; they are set to guard him " (12).

The tablet then tells how lamentation was made for the god, and how, when he had been bound, " he vanished from among the living " (13), and was sent down into the depths away from the sun and the light of the day (14). A celebrant is wrapped in cerements (?) stained red with the blood from the wounds wherewith Bêl had been wounded (15); his consort waits for him (presumably at the entrance to the Mountain), having gone down to seek for him (16); but " a son of Ashshur —whatever that may mean, either the god Nebo or merely an Assyrian—refuses to descend into hell in search of Bêl," exclaiming: " I am not a sinner, and I will not be wounded " (17); he becomes one of the watchmen appointed to keep guard over the prison (9). The next verse is perhaps the most remarkable in the whole piece, for it states that a malefactor was led out and executed with the god:

" [The head] is bound to the gate of Bêlit (or Zarpânit, the consort of Bêl)—that is, the head of the malefactor who is [led out (?)] and slain with him; his head is bound to the [neck(?)] of Bêlit (20-21)—namely, to the neck of the statue of the goddess Bêlit."

It is unlucky that this important passage is somewhat badly damaged; the first word is missing, and the verb before the words " and slain with him " is doubtful, Professor Zimmern supplying " led out," and Professor Langdon " smitten." It

is also uncertain to what part of the statue of the goddess the head of the malefactor was bound; but the determinative "flesh," which precedes the missing word, proves it to have been a part of her body—*viz.*, of her statue. The next lines are obscure; but it is clear that, Nebo having returned to his own temple in Borsippa, the city is in an uproar, and fighting breaks out among the excited inhabitants (22-23). Nebo appears then to come back from Borsippa, which was the centre of his cult, to Babylon to do homage to the dead Bêl, and to gaze upon the body of the malefactor; he is preceded by priests and enchanters, who sing hymns and recite prayers, symbolizing the mourners for Bêl. At the same time the goddess Bêlit, who is escorted by magicians or heralds weeping for Bêl, descends in search of him to the mountain of the lower world (24-29). The following lines give a list, apparently, of Bêl's raiment and jewels (8), and of his shroud, which are brought before Ishtar (30-31); and the next line passes abruptly to an account of his suckling and kindly treatment at the hands of Ishtar (33).

The priests then recite the Epic of Creation (34), and a celebrant, representing Bêl himself, prays for mercy, asking, "What are my sins?" (36), seeing that, though innocent, he had been bound and put to death, and, looking up to heaven, prays to Sin and Shamash that Bêl may be restored to life. His prayer is heard, and "he (*i.e.*, Bêl) comes from the midst of the Mountain" (38); meanwhile Bêlit, who, clad in mourning apparel, was keeping watch over the Temple of Bêl and caring for his body, had wiped away with her hand the blood which has been poured out (43)—namely, the blood which had issued from the wounds inflicted on him; and then a pig is sacrificed, symbolizing the malefactor who was led away and put to death (45-46) and buried in a coffin (56). The remaining lines of the tablet recount the conquest of the storm-god Zû by Ninurta, and the release of Bêl from the tomb by the gods after a battle (57-69), and the whole closes with an imprecation against anyone who should deliberately erase or damage the tablet by plunging it in water, or who should reveal its contents to the uninitiated (70-76).

Briefly stated, the myth contained on this tablet is to the following effect: Bêl, the "Lord" of Ashshur—namely, the chief of the Assyrian pantheon—(or Marduk, in the Babylonian version), is imprisoned in the lower world, having been unjustly done to death, and with him a malefactor. During his imprisonment the city is in confusion and uproar, and his wife Bêlit, "the Lady," escorted by a band of mystics, goes in search of him and, having found his tomb, carefully tends his body;

then, as the result of their prayers, the great gods defeat the powers of darkness and restore Bêl to life, and bring him back to the world above. The most obvious parallel to this story is the legend of the annual death of Tammûz in the autumn, and his restoration to life in the spring as the god of vegetation; in fact, the bringing of Bêl's garments before Ishtar is an element imported from the myth of Tammûz, in which Ishtar herself, the mother of Tammûz, descends to the place of the dead in search of her dead son. Another parallel, to which Professor Zimmern has called attention, is the Scythian festival known as the Sacæa; in connection with the rites belonging to this festival, the Greek writer Athenæus says that the Sacæa were held at Babylon in September, clearly confusing a Scythian and Babylonian ritual. At it, according to the same writer, the masters were subject to their slaves, while one of the latter governed the house and was clothed in royal apparel—in which many readers will recall the " boy-bishop " of the Middle Ages. According to another version, given by Dio Chrysostom, the Sacæ was a Persian festival, at which a prisoner who had been condemned to death was set on the king's throne, clothed in the king's raiment, and permitted to rule the land, drink to his heart's content, and use the king's wives as his own; but afterwards he was led away and put to death. These rites are all, it seems clear, closely connected, and perhaps all are to be traced back to Babylon; for the temporary abdication of the king in Dio Chrysostom's account must certainly be referred to one act in the Babylonian ritual of the New Year, in which the king went to the chapel of Bêl, took off his royal *insignia*, and handed them to the high priest, who pulled his ear and smote his cheek.

Interesting as these parallels are, especially the confirmation of a conjecture made some years ago by Professor Zimmern that Marduk or Bêl would prove to be a vegetation-god corresponding to Tammûz in his disappearance, descent into the world below, and resurrection, the whole ritual of Bêl has received great prominence from the analogies drawn by the same scholar between Bêl's sufferings and the Passion of Christ. He draws up the following table of parallel passages:

In the Babylonian Ritual.	In the New Testament.
Bêl taken prisoner.	Christ taken prisoner.
Bêl questioned in " the house on the edge of the mountain."	Christ examined in the house of the High Priest and of Pilate.
Bêl wounded.	Christ scourged.
Bêl led away to the " mountain."	Christ led away to crucifixion on Golgotha.

A malefactor led away with Bêl.	Two robbers led out and crucified with Christ.
A " son of Ashshur " justified, and not sent to the world below with Bêl.	Barabbas released by Pilate, and so not led out with Christ.
After Bêl's descent, uproar in the city.	After Christ's death, the veil of the Temple rent and the earth torn by an earthquake.
Bêl's garments taken away.	Christ's clothes taken and divided among the soldiers.
Bêlit, a woman, wipes away the blood from Bêl's clothes.	Mary Magdalene and two women desire to anoint the body of Christ.
Bêl confined in the " mountain," away from the light and the sun.	Christ in the sepulchre; His descent into Hell.
Watchers keep watch over Bêl in the " mountain."	Watchers keep watch over Christ's sepulchre.
A goddess, probably Bêlit, watches by the Temple of Bêl.	Mary Magdalene and the other Mary sit by Christ's sepulchre.
People seek for Bêl, not knowing where he has gone; especially his consort, in mourning apparel, seeks him at the gate of the grave.	Women, among them Mary Magdalene, come to the grave, seeking for Christ; especially Mary Magdalene stands weeping before the empty grave.
Bêl is restored to life, and comes back from the " mountain " to the world above, like the vernal sun.	Christ comes back to life, leaves the grave on a Sunday, and is seen by several people.
Bêl's principal festival, the Babylonian New Year's Feast in Nisan at the time of the vernal equinox, celebrates his victory over the powers of darkness.	The principal Christian feast of Easter, held at the time of the vernal equinox, celebrates Christ's victory over death.

Professor Zimmern gave an outline of his views originally in 1902 in the second part of Schrader's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, and again in 1910 in a pamphlet entitled *Zum Streit um die Christusmythe*. His theory is that, as the tendency of Jewish writers was to clothe Yahweh and, at a later period, the archangel Michael with the attributes of Marduk, and to attribute to them achievements based on the exploits of that god as handed down in Babylonian legends—for example, the conquest of the powers of evil after hard-fought battles—and coloured not infrequently with ideas characteristic of Parseeism, Mithraism, and Zoroastrianism, so these attributes were passed on to the Messiah in later Judaism, where he obtained a position of fundamental importance as standing midway between God and man; derived from Yahweh, and ultimately from the cycle of legends about Marduk, they were the means whereby the picture of the Jewish Messiah was directly influenced by Babylonian and

Parsee doctrines. This late Judaic character of the Messiah was transferred wholesale by the primitive Christians to the person of the historical Jesus of Nazareth. And so Professor Zimmern writes: "Since in this way an historically well-founded line of development—Marduk-Yahweh-Christ, and ultimately also, directly, Christ-Marduk—results, we have then, too, every reason for bringing the figure and the work of Christ into connection with the figure and the workings of Marduk, and, indeed, as much where the figure of Christ is immediately dependent on Yahweh in the Old Testament, in so far as Yahweh on his side, in this respect, goes back to Marduk, as also where this intermediary does not occur; but there comes into consideration a conception, foreign to the Old Testament and newly adopted by later Judaism, which, however, certainly does not represent a genuine Jewish conception, in this last case with the limitation, on which stress has already been laid, of a possible simultaneously Parsee influence." Professor Zimmern then traces in detail the parallel development in the stories respectively of Marduk and of Christ—how both are said to have been only-begotten sons, both world-redeemers, both sent into the world by their fathers, and, lastly, how both were put to death and rose again from the dead.

To what do these comparisons amount? Surely, very little; for they are often imperfect, sometimes far-fetched, and almost always entirely superficial. Moreover, they can be found to exist between the myths and legends of many countries, as Frazer's *Golden Bough* amply proves. Why not compare the story how Isaac was saved from sacrifice by the substitution of a ram caught in a thicket, and that of Iphigenia's delivery from a similar fate by the substitution of a stag in her place by the goddess Artemis; or the legend of St. Christopher, who carried Christ in the person of a little child across a river, with that of Jason, who bore the goddess Hera, disguised as an old woman, on his shoulders through the flood Amaurus? So, too, the story of Moses' committal to the Nile in an ark of bulrushes finds a parallel in the legend that Sargon I., king of Agade (*c.* 2650 B.C.) was in like manner committed to the river at his birth in an ark made of reeds. However historical or unhistorical the character of these stories may be, no one disbelieves them *merely because* similar tales have been found in pagan literature. Yet are they a whit less striking than that of Bêlit weeping at the gate of Bêl's grave as compared with Mary Magdalene weeping at the sepulchre of Jesus? With sufficient ingenuity and labour parallels, more or less exact, can be found to almost every story, whether legendary or historical; but this does not mean that the one has been

borrowed from the other, and is therefore false. Similar situations almost inevitably recur in the history of individuals as of nations. Further, such similarities in the case of legends concerning a descent into hell and a subsequent return to life are of singularly little value, since these stories abound in the religions and the folk-lore of nearly every nation; consequently, it is hardly possible not to discover resemblances. For example, the Babylonians and Assyrians told of such descents and resurrections of no less than four of their principal deities, Nergal, Marduk, Tammûz, and Ishtar. The Greeks and Romans were not unlike them in this respect; it would be as profitable to compare Christ's raising of the daughter of Jairus from the dead with the bringing back of Alcestis from the lower world by Heracles. In fact, Professor Zimmern has to rely only on isolated details which can be compared in the two stories; but it is a truism that a cumulative argument proves nothing.

Lastly, it is a well-known fact that most nations love to clothe their heroes in imagery borrowed from the most diverse sources. Poets are particularly prone to the borrowing of phrases from earlier writers and to the using of them rather to adorn a sentence than as accurately descriptive of that to which they would apply them. What if the Passion of Christ is described in phrases borrowed from the prophet's description of the Suffering Servant in the Second Isaiah, or if certain incidents in the Passion are told in, or coloured by, words borrowed from the Psalms? This does not invalidate the historical value of the Evangelists' narratives, especially when we remember that accuracy in the setting of a scene was not considered essential by an ancient historian. His object was to confine himself to the story, not to hamper himself with over-scrupulous accuracy in the details, which he was none the less fond of embellishing with phrases reminiscent of the past history of his race; yet, although there was undoubtedly a stock of legends common to all the Semitic peoples, each race drew on them to a different degree and used them in a different way. The Babylonians put the story of the creation of the world in a coarse, polytheistic setting, the Hebrews spiritualized it and made it a vehicle for teaching a pure monotheism; as they treated the story of the creation, so did they handle that of the righteous sufferer. Whether the Suffering Servant of the Hebrew prophet is an example of the same phenomenon is still doubtful; certainly, no close parallel has yet been found in Babylonian literature. Far more doubtful, therefore, is it if the story of the Passion is so to be regarded; for it is reminiscent far more strongly of certain Jewish Psalms and some of the prophets,

however "Babylonian" much of their imagery may be, than of anything Babylonian. Indeed, Professor Zimmern seems to have paid far more attention to superficial details than to the *motif* of either story; many of the resemblances, such as the presence of weeping women at the grave, would be likely to recur in any account whatsoever of a death and a burial, while others are purely accidental, if not actually the reverse, such as the presence of one in place of two malefactors. Any reader who cares to do so can, indeed, find far more dissemblances than resemblances in the accounts of the death and resurrection respectively of Bêl or Marduk and of Christ.

G. R. Driver.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON

It is no exaggeration to assert that these extraordinary lyrics are unfamiliar to the majority of educated Christians, and that even those who know of their existence do not possess much information about them. They seem, therefore, to furnish a fit subject for an article in Theology.*

That a series of compositions bearing such a title should be in existence is not surprising, since in 1 Kings iv. 32 we read of Solomon that he composed 1,005 songs (LXX ᾠδαί), while a series of eighteen *Psalms of Solomon*, a pseudonymous work of the first century B.C., was edited by one Cerda, a Spanish Jesuit, as long ago as 1626, and has been studied with some care in recent years. In the Index to the *Codex Alexandrinus* these eighteen Psalms are mentioned, and they stand separated from the Canonical Apocalypse only by the two epistles attributed to Clement of Rome.

In the (probably sixth century) *Synopsis Sanctæ Scripturæ*, which is associated with the name of Athanasius, occurs the list:

The books of Maccabees.
Ptolemaica (some unknown book on Egyptian history).
The Psalms and *odes* of Solomon.
The History of Susanna.

In the ninth-century *Stichometry* of Nicephorus we find enumerated:

Three books of Maccabees.
The Wisdom of Solomon.
Ecclesiasticus.

* The conclusion of the study of the odes by a Seminar (of which the writer was a member), held at Cambridge during 1922–3, gives occasion for this particular article.

The Psalms and *odes* of Solomon, containing 2,100 verses.
Esther.
Judith.
Susanna.
Tobit.

It was clear from this, to those who read the lists, that, besides the eighteen Psalms, there had been in existence as late as the ninth century another (probably) pseudonymous collection called *Odes of Solomon*, and that it had been at that time placed in fairly good company among the *Old* Testament apocrypha. No complete MS., however, was known until as recently as the year 1909, when Dr. Rendel Harris* announced that he had discovered a Syriac version written on paper, possibly between three and four hundred years old, and that it had come to him, he believed, about two years previously from the valley of the Tigris, together with a miscellaneous collection of other Syriac leaves. Prior to this discovery, the only place where the text of any of these odes could be read was in the *Pistis Sophia*.† The *Pistis Sophia* is a curious Gnostic book, which is thought to have been composed in Egypt somewhere between A.D. 200 and 250. Its general scheme is a series of conversations purporting to have taken place on the Mount of Olives between the Risen Lord and His disciples, male and female, in the twelfth year after the Resurrection. In these conversations the Lord describes the story of His ascent during the twelve years to the place of the Prime Mystery, and tells how during His journey He encountered the unfortunate Pistis Sophia (who seems to represent Humanity), also on her journey, and sorely hindered by her inability to pass certain monstrous forms which block her way. Whilst she is in the midst of her affliction she sees the Lord passing by, and addresses to Him a series of hymns called Metanoiai, or acts of penitence. At the end of twelve of these she is delivered, and is received into the Prime Mystery.

To any who have studied the devotions associated with some of the mystery religions, this scheme, of course, presents familiar features. The neophyte on initiation goes round the temple and fulfils symbolically the wandering through the heavenly places (*τὰ οὐράνια*) through the twelve hours of the night, and at each "station" there is an appropriate devotional exercise.‡ The *Pistis Sophia* is really the handbook of a mystery, and the wanderings of Sophia herself were

* It is to Dr. Rendel Harris's edition that I owe some of these facts, and also the translations of the extracts here given.

† Trans. G. R. S. Mead.

‡ A Christian adaptation of this kind of devotional exercise is, of course, to be found in the "stations of the Cross."

very likely meant to be mystically re-enacted by its members, who would go through the series of Metanoiai, and in the end, like Sophia herself, gain deliverance or σωτηρία—*i.e.*, initiation into the Prime Mystery.

But of what do the Metanoiai consist? In certain cases they are Gnostic paraphrases of the Canonical Psalms. In five cases, however, they are described as what "Thy light-power prophesied formerly through Solomon in his —thode."

The *Pistis Sophia* contains, then, five of the odes of Solomon in a more or less complete form (Ode 5 being used twice). This fact was known at least a century ago. We have now in addition Dr. Rendel Harris's apparently complete MS. of forty-two odes (one, No. 2, missing), in which it is found that the *Pistis Sophia* odes are included, and correspond to Odes 1, 5, 6, 22, and 25.

We have ventured to refer in detail to this occurrence of the five odes in the *Pistis Sophia*, because it is felt by some students to throw a light upon the use and object of the entire collection. They are thought to be baptismal hymns, psalms of initiation into a Christian "mystery." However this may be, we do not at present actually know anything assured as to the authorship of the odes, whether they are from one hand or from several, whether they were originally written in Greek, as most scholars think, or whether the Syriac is the original. We do not even know for certain the date or provenance of the odes. They may come from the Syriac-speaking Church, or from Egypt. Probably the balance to-day inclines in the direction of the latter source. Whatever their origin, whoever their author may have been, the fundamental fact about them is that they appear in the main to be Christian, though some may be Jewish. In order to show their general tone and temper, let us give Ode 10* in full:

Ode 10.

(1) The Lord hath directed my mouth by His word: and He hath opened my heart by His light: and He hath caused to dwell in me His deathless life, (2) and gave me that I might speak the fruit of His peace: (3) to convert the souls of them who are willing to come to Him: and to lead captive a good captivity for freedom. (4) I was strengthened and made mighty, and took the world captive, (5) and it became to me for the praise of the Most High, and of God my Father. (6) And the Gentiles were gathered together who were scattered abroad. (7) And I was unpolluted by my love for them, because they confessed me in high places: and the traces of the light were set upon their heart, (8) and they walked in my life and were saved, and became my people for ever and ever. Hallelujah.

* Trans. J. Rendel Harris.

In Odes 3 and 7 the Son is referred to as in the Johannine literature. There are, in fact, Johannine touches at intervals throughout the odes.

Thus, in Ode 12, verses 9-11, we read:

"... They were penetrated by the Word; and they knew Him who made them, because they were in concord; for the mouth of the Most High spake to them; and His explanation ran by means of it: for the dwelling-place of the Word is man: and its truth is love."

Ode 24 refers to the Dove fluttering over the Messiah. Ode 42 says: "I stretched out my hands and approached my Lord: for the stretching out of my hands is His Sign: my expansion is the outspread tree which was set up on the way to the Righteous One." Ode 27 has almost the same phrase. Ode 19 (second part) refers in a striking fashion to the Virgin birth in a passage which is quoted by Lactantius as evidence for the Blessed Mother's painless delivery: "The Spirit opened the womb of the Virgin, and she received conception and brought forth; and the Virgin became a Mother with many mercies; and she travailed and brought forth a Son without incurring pain," etc.

The Harrowing of Hell is also referred to several times (e.g., Ode 42), and seems a favourite topic.

Dr. Rendel Harris has shown that there is a probability of common authorship in Odes 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 (?), 10, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20 (?), 21, 26, 28, 35, 40, 41. He thinks 42 may not belong to the main body of the collection, and that 22, 23, 38, and 39 are difficult to group with the others.

Dr. Bernard, the well-known Irish scholar, is mainly concerned to establish the probability of the odes being a corpus of baptismal hymns, and he lays stress in consequence upon such expressions as "They wove for me a crown of truth" in Ode 1.

Mgr. Batiffol, in his edition of the odes, argues that Solomon stands spiritually for Our Lord, and that the general doctrine of the odes is Docetic. The type of passage which he quotes in support of this is Ode 17, 6: "And all that saw Me were amazed: and I was regarded by them as a strange person." His argument is somewhat weakened by the fact that in many of the odes the speaker appears to be a redeemed human being, and not the Messiah. Hence, the putting on of "an incorruptible body, free from pain or sickness," loses its force as an expression of Docetic ideas.

It seems likely to Professor Rendel Harris that the odes can be safely dated back into the second century, but this view is not shared by all scholars. The way in which the author of the *Pistis Sophia* has transcribed portions of them towards

the middle of the third century shows nevertheless that the odes were at this time treated as almost canonical in authority, and that they may be anything from fifty to one hundred years earlier.

They are in many respects Judaic. Ode 4, indeed, seems to be hardly Christian. It is concerned at the proposal to change "the holy place" to another locality.

Irenæus (bk. iv., chap. xxv.) seems to quote Ode 4. There seems also to be a slight influence from Odes 6, 7, and 14, evident in Clement of Alexandria in his *Protrepticus*, par. 5. The general atmosphere of the odes, however, is primitive rather than Hellenistic. It is not at all like that of literature arising in a purely gentile community.

The odes represent a very high level of spiritual experience and an intense warmth of personal devotion. It is, perhaps, for this reason that they appeal more to the individualist Evangelical than to the Catholic scholar. "Nonconformists," it has been said, "are fascinated by them. Churchmen, in the main, are bored by them." Oddly enough, this is broadly true; nor need we be astonished. The orthodoxy or Catholicity of the odes is open to question. They may easily turn out some day to be of heretical origin. On the other hand, their fervour and personal testimony are remarkable. "I was justified in my Lord: my incorruptible salvation is He. . . . The Lord is my hope; in Him I shall not be confounded. For according to His praise He made me, and according to His goodness even so He gave unto me. . . .

"Faithful is He in whom I have believed: He has richly blessed me, and my head is with Him. I should not have known how to love the Lord if He had not loved me. . . . I love the Beloved and my soul loves Him, and where His rest is there also am I." These quotations are typical, and they might almost have been taken from the testifyings of a Methodist convert. They belong to a realm of personal experience from which proceed such revivalist lyrics as—

"Blessed assurance, Jesus is mine," etc.

It must not be imagined that when we have said this we have disposed of the odes, and classified them among the various types of Christian literature. On the contrary, they abound in puzzles, and there is some exceptionally striking or eccentric feature about nearly half of them. Let us proceed to demonstrate this.

Ode 4 contains the mysterious verse: "No man, O Lord, changeth Thy holy place." What exactly is the historical reference?

Ode 6 speaks of the great river in flood which brought water to the Temple. Is this Christian or Jewish, and who are "the ministers of that draught"?

Ode 9 speaks of peace and war. Is this a spiritual reference, or is it historical?

Ode 13 has a curious metaphor about a mirror. Is there any connection with 2 Cor. iv.?

Ode 16 seems in its latter half composite, and a mosaic of some of the Psalms of David.

Ode 17 has a curious passage about Hades: "And I went over all my bondmen to loose them, that I might not leave any man bound or binding," etc.

Ode 19 is the most extravagant of all in its use of the metaphor of grace or the Incarnation as milk from the breasts of God.

Ode 22 has a strange reference to the destruction of a dragon with seven heads, a monster which cannot be identified historically.

Ode 23 will have to be dealt with in detail on account of its curious metaphors of the letter and the wheel.

Ode 24 has a strange and fanciful description of the Baptism of Christ.

Ode 25, with its reference to the "raiment of skin," shows a close connection with the Rabbinical exegesis of Genesis iii. 21, and also with a passage in the *Kabbala* (Zohar ii. 29, *b*).

Ode 28 has an extraordinary Docetic sentence: "I did not perish, for I was not their Mother, nor was my birth like theirs: and they sought for my death and did not find it, for I was older than the memorial of theirs."

Ode 33 refers mysteriously to a "perfect virgin" who "stood and was proclaiming and calling and saying, O ye sons of men, return ye." Is this Divine Wisdom, or the Church, as in the *Shepherd of Hermas?*

Ode 36 seems to refer to the Holy Spirit as the mother who brought forth the Christ, and may be Ebionite in theology.

Ode 38 introduces the chariot of truth, and also the bride and bridegroom who corrupt and are corrupted. Some have thought that the reference here is to Simon Magus and Helena.

Ode 39 seems to refer to the incident of Christ's walking on the water.

Probably the most interesting feature of the odes has hardly been touched upon in any of the editions of them which have hitherto appeared. By this we mean their remarkable affinity in certain points with passages in Oriental literature.

We will confine ourselves to two instances:

(i) The resemblances between one of the odes and certain Bhakti hymns.

(ii) The resemblances in Oriental literature to the metaphors of the twenty-third ode.

(i)

Let us take the first five verses of Ode 19, with their grotesque and to us almost monstrous metaphors.

ODE 19, VERSES 1–5.

(1) A cup of milk was offered to me: and I drank it in the sweetness of the delight of the Lord. (2) The Son is the cup, and He who was milked is the Father, (3) and the Holy Spirit milked Him: because His breasts were full, and it was necessary for Him that His milk should be sufficiently released, (4) and the Holy Spirit opened His bosom and mingled the milk from the two breasts of the Father; and gave the mixture to the world without their knowing; (5) and they who receive in its fulness are the ones on the right hand. . . .

This conception is easily paralleled in the hymns of Namdev and Tukaram, the Marathi saints.* The particular Hindu deity of whom they write is obviously of the male sex (as its image shows). Yet Tukaram applies to it feminine epithets, and the same kind of language as we find in Ode 10. Plainly the figurative expressions belong to the language of Oriental religious devotion.

PSALM XVIII. NAMDEV 14. C. A. D.

My Mother thou; thy suckling babe am I:
Feed me with love, my Pandurang, I cry.
I am the calf with thee the mother cow;
Thy milk, my Pandurang, withhold not now.

PSALM XLIII. TUKARAM 1608, 49. A. D.

With milk of love, ah, suckle me!
At thy abounding breast,
O Mother haste. In thee, in thee
My sad heart findeth rest.

NOTE.—The deity to whom these words were addressed is Vithoba, a male divinity identified with Krishna.

The language of personal devotion, even where it refrains from extravagances such as these, is remarkably alike in all religions, and the psalms of the Marathi saints resemble in general not only these *Odes of Solomon*, but also the Hebrew and Babylonian Psalms, and the mystical poems of all lands. The curious metaphor referred to above is, however, rather exceptional, and therefore all the more striking.

* See *Psalms of Marathi Saints*, an English version, edited by Dr. Nicol MacNicol and published in India. I am indebted to Dr. Sydney Cave, of Cheshunt College, for bringing it to my notice.

(ii)

In dealing with the twenty-third ode, it seems best to print first the extract from it, and afterwards some of the passages which resemble it wholly or in part.

Ode 23, Verse 5 to End.

"And His thought was like a letter: His will descended from on High, and it was sent like an arrow which is violently shot from the bow: and many hands rushed to the letter to seize it and to take it and read it: and it escaped their fingers, and they were affrighted at it and at the seal that was on it. Because it was not permitted them to loose its seal: for the power that was over the seal was greater than they. But those who saw it went after the letter that they might know where it would alight, and who should read it, and who should hear it. But a wheel received it and came over it; and there was with it a sign of the Kingdom and of the Government: and everything which tried to move the wheel it mowed and cut down: and it gathered the multitude of adversaries, and bridged the rivers, and crossed over and rooted up many forests and made a broad path. The head went down to the feet, for down to the feet ran the wheel, and that which was a sign upon it. The letter was one of command, for there were gathered (or included) in it all districts, and there was seen at its head, the head which was revealed, even the Son of Truth from the Most High Father, and He inherited and took possession of everything. And the thought of the many was brought to nought, and all the apostates hasted and fled away. And those who persecuted and were enraged became extinct. And the letter was a great volume, which was wholly written by the finger of God: [and the name of the Father was on it, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, to rule for ever and ever]. Hallelujah." (*Professor Rendel Harris's translation.*)

It is worth mentioning that the above translation does not quite fully represent the peculiar phrasing of the ode in the Syriac, and that Mgr. Batiffol regards the original text as omitting the words in square brackets.

Kindred Passages.

(*a*) *The Letter.*

1. "In the name of the Life.
A well-sealed letter is it
Which goeth out of the world.
A letter written with Kushta (Truth)
Sealed with the signet-ring of the Great.
Perfect persons have written it,
Faithful men have secured it.
They hanged it round the neck of the soul
And sent him to the gate of Life.
The soul in its wisdom drove its nails into the letter.
It drove its nails into the letter,
Laid it in brightness and uncovered it," etc.

(*From a Mandean document printed by Lidzbarski, and quoted by Reitzenstein in his "Iranisches Erlösungsmysterium."*)

2. Stanzas 8–11 of the Syriac Hymn of the Soul also refer to a mysterious sealed letter.

"This was my letter, sealed with the King's own seal on the cover.
Lest it should fall in the hands of the fierce Babylonian demons."
(*Trans. Professor Burkitt.*)

3. Compare also Rev. v. 1-5.

(*b*) *The Wheel.*

The symbol of the wheel is to the East very much what the Cross is to the West. It is used interchangeably either as a symbol of existence (the world as an unending cycle of rebirth and repetition) or as a symbol of divinity. Probably to the mind of an Eastern, with its pantheistic tendency, the two uses were related. The wheel of life is a conception found among the Pythagoreans, as indeed is not surprising, since their fundamental conceptions are frankly Eastern. The actual phrase τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως occurs but once in the New Testament (in James iii. 6), and its application here defeats all attempts at exegesis. The wheel only occurs in the West after the Crusades, when what is called the Wheel of Fortune appears in wall-paintings, specimens of which may be seen at Rochester Cathedral, and in Kingston Church near Cambridge.*

The following passage from the *Dialogues of the Buddha*, ii. 202-204, seems to refer to a conquering wheel very much like that of the ode:

"When he (the King) had gone up on to the upper storey of his palace on the sacred day, the day of the full moon, and purified himself to keep the sacred day, there then appeared to him the heavenly treasure of the Wheel, with its nave, its fire, and all its thousand spokes complete.

"Then the King arose from his seat, and reverently uncovering his robe from his right shoulder, he held in his left hand a pitcher, and with his right he sprinkled water over the Wheel, as he said:

"'Roll onward, O my Lord the Wheel! O my Lord, go forth and overcome!'

"Then the wondrous Wheel rolled onward toward the region of the East. And after it went the King with his fourfold army. . . . And wheresoever the Wheel stopped, there, too, the King stayed, and wheresoever the Wheel stopped, there, too, the King stayed, and with him his army in its fourfold array.

"Then all the rival Kings in the region of the East came to the King and said, 'Come on, O mighty King! Welcome, O mighty King! All is thine, O mighty King! Do thou, O mighty King, be a teacher unto us!'

"And the King said: 'Ye shall slay no living thing. Ye shall not take that which has not been given. Ye shall not act wrongly by touching the bodily desires. Ye shall speak no lie. Ye shall drink no maddening drink. And ye may still enjoy such privileges as ye have had of yore.'

"Then all the rival Kings in the region of the East became subject to the King. And the wondrous Wheel, having plunged down into the great waters in the East, rose up out again, and rolled onward to the South . . . and to the West . . . and to the North, and all happened *in each region* as in the East.

"Now when the wondrous Wheel had gone forth conquering and to conquer over the whole earth to its very ocean boundary, it returned back again to the royal city. . . ."

* [Does this also throw light on the curious fresco on the wall of Kempley church in Gloucestershire?—Ed.]

If the ideas at the back of Ode 23 are Christian, they are, at least, expressed in very unusual metaphors.

The Gospel may be a letter, or the letter may be the Incarnation of the word. The Wheel (which in the Buddhist legend is plainly the solar disk) may here represent the Divine Humanity or the Church. It is all guess-work. What is certain, however, is that we have here either a piece of Gnostic hymn-writing, resembling to some degree the Hymn of the Soul in the Acts of Judas Thomas—in other words, a lyric of "a new religion" (to quote Professor A. A. Bevan) which somehow missed fire; or we have a Christian ode, Christian in the sense in which most of the other Solomonic odes are Christian, but expressing its Christianity with very bold Oriental non-Christian imagery. The descent of the Wheel is obviously either a harrowing of hell or a last judgment, and its effect on the wicked is the same as in most other Apocalyptic writings—"they became extinct."

I hope that these various extracts may serve to show what a number of interesting problems lie yet unsolved in these remarkable odes.

Space forbids me to deal with the editions of them which have been issued by Dr. Gunkel and Dr. Harnack, whose conclusions do not in every respect agree with those of English-speaking scholars.

With the development of new infant communities of Oriental Christians, it seems not improbable that we may see a revival of such forms of literature as are represented by the *Odes of Solomon*, and it is not inconceivable that when these new lyrics come to be composed they may help to explain to us the meaning and significance of the old.

A. C. Bouquet.

VILLAGE FOLK AND CONFESSION

I.—The Problem.

Church life in rural districts, as we are continually reminded, presents its particular problems. Not the least of these lies in the sphere of penitence, in the extreme difficulty which the Church experiences in leading the rustic to express his penitence. This is, of course, really part of a wider problem—how to arouse that sense of sin which must precede all real penitence, expressed or unexpressed. The rural lack of the sense of sin is painfully obvious to all who in English villages work for our

Blessed Lord. But a lack of the sense of sin is not the problem we shall discuss in this article, which deals rather with the *expression* of penitence when once the sense of sin has been aroused. The spirit of penitence—so difficult to arouse—needs, when aroused, focussing and intensifying by definite self-expression. If it is not in some way expressed, it has a way of evaporating altogether. And to us Catholics—apart from the benefit of grace received in Absolution—the safest and best way of expressing penitence is found in the Church's sacrament of Penance.

Here, then, is the problem succinctly stated. Thousands of Catholic-minded country priests themselves habitually use sacramental Confession, and know gratefully its immense value for the receiving of Divine pardon and grace, and for the disciplining and training of wayward character. There is nothing which they would more earnestly desire for their flocks than that the bulk of them should habitually and devoutly use the same means of grace, with its uplifting, humbling, and strengthening power. They therefore preach of it occasionally, and never fail to tell their Confirmation candidates about it; but nothing much comes of such teaching, and over and over again it happens that the priest is the only Christian in his parish who makes his Confessions. This fact comes home to him with special sadness and some bitterness on the eve of the great festivals. At a time when he feels that he should be shriving souls, he finds himself carefully keeping out of church in order to avoid a little army of decorators.

It would be interesting to know if there are in England five or ten villages where the Church-folk naturally and freely accept Church discipline, and avail themselves of the privileges which it offers. If a few such villages could be quoted, it would not alter the significant fact that from one end of England to the other the sacrament of Penance plays practically no part at all in the Church life of the village.

The rural priest is always conscious—and especially conscious in these introspective days—of serious failure on his part; if he be a Catholic, he feels this never more strongly than in his failure to teach his people to value the sacrament of Divine forgiveness.

We come back, then, to our opening statement that a great problem of Church life in the country lies in the sphere of penitence. If Confession is good for the soul, and with the mouth Confession is made unto salvation, how is the Church in the villages to teach her children to use this means of grace?

The question is one that cannot be answered without deep consideration of all that has gone to make the present state

of things. We are realizing now that the individual of to-day is bound up in the bundle of his forefathers; it will be so in this question as in all others. If there is a cause for every effect, the reason for the present utter neglect of a sacrament lies in historical facts; and these facts must be duly marked, learnt, and inwardly digested by him who would seek to do his part in remedying so colossal a failure.

II.—Some Historical Reasons.

Let us think, then, of some of the reasons for the rural slowness to use the sacrament of Penance.

First and foremost we must put *the lack of plain teaching by the parish priest*. The priest, in teaching penitence, is inclined—as, indeed, in the teaching of other practices—to be vague and abstract, rather than definite and concrete; and the rural mind is reached only by the concrete. When we speak of "the spiritual life" or "the Incarnation," the phrases make no impression on our rustic hearers' minds; whereas, if we speak of "trying to be holier Christians" or "the Son of God becoming a Babe," they will see what we are trying to say. So it is futile for the parish priest to speak about "the sacrament of Penance" or "the ministry of reconciliation," taking it for granted that his flock will understand his meaning. They will understand nothing of the sort unless he is far more definite. He must explain what sacramental Confession is. He must talk less about the "ministry of reconciliation," but in the simplest and directest way about "going to Confession" or "confessing to a priest." The depth of our people's ignorance is far greater than most of us realize; they do not read Church papers, and their knowledge, or right knowledge, on the subject will depend entirely upon us. We shall not, therefore, be doing our duty by them if we content ourselves with reading the first Exhortation in the Liturgy before the great festivals, or with an occasional vague reference to an ordinance of which they know nothing in detail. Not so are villagers led to Confession.

Another difficulty lies in the fact, often forgotten, that *the money question comes into the matter*. Church-people of a town parish can hardly realize how far the influence of the rectory in a small village may touch the material interests or welfare of any parishioner. The incumbent, in various ways, has for many generations been responsible for money payments to a considerable portion of his flock. As school correspondent, or rector, or manager of the village club, he will have made regular payments to caretakers or clerk or cleaners. With him will probably have rested, if not the payment, yet the appointment, of sexton, organist, church and school cleaners, inmates

of almshouses and of similar institutions. In many small parishes the incumbent has even had sole administration of the Churchwardens' funds and of parochial charities. If in these days of parochial Church Councils he is no longer a financial autocrat on a small scale, his influence is still felt and known in a dozen ways of this kind. Add to this influence arising from his official position the fact that he often employs a regular gardener, perhaps two, may often give an out-of-work parishioner a few days' work, and has opportunities of recommending parishioners for work outside the parish as tradesmen or servants, and you will see how many parishioners still, though less than in old days, will conceive it of real importance that the parson should think well of their personal character.

All this may seem to the instructed town Churchman of little connection with the sacrament of Penance; but it has a very real import in the problem which we are discussing—a problem which is largely psychological. For until the villager fully understands what is meant by the seal of Confession—and how many village Churchmen know anything at all about it?—he will hesitate, and hesitate long, before he confesses his sins to "the rector" or "the vicar." When moved to repentance, he might make the plunge and go to Confession to a priest who happened to be taking a Mission in the parish—if he knew enough about Confession to know that what he confessed would go no further than the confessor's ears; but to confess to his own incumbent would be to many so serious a step that courage to take it would fail. I have sometimes thought that for this reason we should make it plainer, not only that the confessor's future personal attitude to the penitent is not changed by what he hears in Confession, but also that Confession need not necessarily be to the penitent's own parish priest. The shyness and timidity of the rustic in the whole matter can hardly be exaggerated, or too much care and thought be taken to meet it.

A third difficulty lies in the rustic's *shyness of public opinion*. It is quite one thing to be friendly with the parson when he meets you in the street or calls at your house, but it is a very different matter to be seen by neighbours entering the church on a week-day (in some parishes an almost unheard of thing) at an hour when no service is impending, and to face the questions to which that might subject the penitent at the lips of neighbours, or of others who by no means share his desire for the assurance of forgiveness of sins.

But beneath these various obstacles, in themselves formidable enough, to the practice of Confession lies another deeper difficulty. These are, so to speak, the "accidents" of village

life, which will vary greatly in their influence according to the particular tone or opinion of particular villages. A deeper reason will be found underlying these, common to the English rustic mind wherever met—namely, *the natural reticence and reserve of the country poor towards the upper classes*. The parish priest in a country parish is one of the "gentry," and his position is often unduly accentuated by the possession of a huge rectory and grounds, and, it may be, of a motor-car. Any friend of the country poor who has observed them sympathetically will have realized their somewhat pathetic reluctance to own themselves in the wrong in any matter, but especially before their "betters." This engrained tendency will greatly increase their hesitancy (and if a man hesitates long to take a difficult step, he generally fails to take it at all) in confessing to their parish priest. Since the Great War the villager has been able to adopt—to the relief of some of us—a more independent attitude towards his "betters." But have we realized how utterly dependent, until quite lately, the farm-labourer (who constitutes the bulk of our village population) was dependent upon one or two neighbours who were socially above him? He might lose his work at a week's notice through the whim or passing ill-temper of the farmer, or through a fit of sulks on his own part; and the question as to whether he received help from parochial charities or private charity from the hall or rectory depended largely upon how he stood in the eyes of the parson. In the face of this dependence, the labourer's strength lay in reticence. He had nothing to gain by acknowledging faults, and everything to lose. The "under-dog" was not likely, by unduly confiding in his "betters," to give himself away unnecessarily. The labourer acquired, through centuries of what was practically serfdom, the habit of silence before his superiors. His reluctance to-day to confess his sins will not be fully understood unless we take psychological account of this reticence, deeply engrained in his character through many centuries by force of his social position.

Indeed, this rustic reserve accounts for much more than we think. For Confession is the act of a free man and a free spirit. It is almost of its essence that the penitent shall have the feeling that this, his voluntary act, shall bring him a joyous sense of personal freedom, unifying all his actions and inspirations. Yet only the really free could feel this. It is possible, but not easy, to conceive the slave as using the sacrament of Penance. If a man is not habitually free in act and thought, his whole tendency will be to secretiveness, and not to self-expression. For how many centuries has the rural worker been anything but free!

In the darkest days of the English Church neither the doctrine nor the practice of sacramental Confession wholly died out. But it lingered, in the three centuries following the "Reformation," only in that small cultured and educated class to which men like Dean Denis Grenville, George Herbert, and Evelyn belonged. There is hardly any age since the first English Prayer Book when one could imagine the rustic Englishman using a sacrament of which the high-and-dry doctrine remained whilst its practice had died out of ordinary Church life. Certainly, he would know nothing of it fifty years ago in Victorian days; nor in the eighteenth century, when Crabbe describes the rustic's wretched drudgery in the fields, and the Poor Law books show his utter dependence upon the farmers and ratepayers; nor in the times of Puritan domination or of Elizabeth.

If this contention is true, as I believe it to be, the neglect of Confession has behind it the habit of several centuries; and a habit so engrained by the lapse of time is not easily dropped or laid aside.

It would be interesting, indeed, to go even behind the Reformation, and question how far the farm-labourer went to his "duties" in medieval times, or in the epoch just before the New Learning. There may be documentary and other evidence for ascertaining a fact so interesting; perhaps some scholar will set his hand to it. Whatever the outcome of his labours might be, this at least is certain, that the habit of age-long custom is utterly against the practice of sacramental Confession; and the countryman does not easily change or drop a mental attitude or a habit of centuries.

These difficulties in the way of sacramental Confession would not be complete without the enumeration of another—viz., Puritan tradition. The prevalent tone of country religion, even in the Church, has been distinctly Puritan, with stress laid upon "Sabbath" observance and Bible-reading, and with a real fear of Romanism. The fires of Smithfield were kindled for country folk as well as for London citizens, and the deep horror and indignation which they aroused is still felt in the sub-conscious repulsion which the rustic has for anything which he believes to be "Catholic." If anyone doubts this prevailing note in village religion, let him ask any church-going villager of his acquaintance what the Christian meaning of the Fourth Commandment is; or let him pay a visit to the village library and glance through the stories dealing with Church history. He will find a large proportion describing the persecution of French Huguenots by Catholics, or the Marian persecution, or Papist cruelty and murder-plotting. Most middle-aged Catholic

Churchmen of to-day have reached their present convictions only by drastically revising the conceptions of Church and sacraments—and especially of Confession—which they had learnt through their childhood's religious romances.

III.—The Prospect.

Does this mean that it is a hopeless task for the village priest to teach the practice of Confession, or that the practice is entirely unsuitable for the spiritual needs of the rustic?

To the second of these two queries the answer must be an unhesitating No! The Catholic Faith is for all men, as its name testifies; and if rightly presented it has its appeal and its value for the English rustic as for any other living man. Nobody who knows the villagers of parts of Catholic Austria or Germany can venture to say that there is anything in the practice of Confession which makes it inherently impossible or unsuitable for the spiritual development of the rustic.

As to the outlook for the future, he is a faithless priest who would despair of teaching his people either Catholic doctrine or practice.

I would venture to suggest one or two lines of thought which may help the country priest towards a healthy and hopeful outlook in the matter.

First of all, the countryman's failure to accept the sacrament of Penance in the past has been, as we have seen, largely due to our own fault, in that we have not taught him; and faults are eradicable. We have seen that the peasant—or, indeed, anyone else—will not be brought to value and practise sacramental Confession unless he has a clear and definite understanding of what it is. And that is exactly what our country congregations have not. In hundreds of parishes, the priest of which makes his own confessions, hardly one person in the congregation—even amongst the Church workers—knows what Confession means or how it is practised. A vast number of English Churchmen have never even heard of it, and if they have heard of it in connection with the English Church, look upon it as an unscriptural imitation of Romish ways.

This state of things is appalling, but it is also clearly remediable. The prevailing ignorance is, after all, entirely due to the lack of definite concrete teaching on the subject; and definite concrete teaching can be given. The parish priest cannot, of course, be always preaching on the subject, nor would he be wise to lay undue stress upon it; but he should be able to find a proportionate place for it in his annual scheme of

pulpit teaching. And when he teaches on the subject, he must not, as we have seen, mince matters, or talk vaguely about the "ministry of reconciliation" or the "sacrament of Penance," and expect his flock to know what he means. He must teach them very plainly that sacramental Confession is a way in which Christ's love offers sinners pardon for the past and grace for the present; he must explain the Scriptural and Prayer Book allusions to it; he must explain the priest's part in the sacrament, and the penitent's; and even very simply teach how a Confession is made and received, and absolution given. Experts tell us that to win people to Confession we should dwell more upon the idea of *forgiveness* than upon that of *confession;* and that is doubtless true, for in the sacrament God is seeking His own, and we must conceive of it as God-given. Yet, even so, it is the actual confessing that country people shrink from. And therefore it is very necessary for the priest to explain the simplicity of it, and to lead his people to understand that it is not a matter of going to the rectory, or of interviewing the rector in his study (and incidentally his wife or domestic at the door); but that the whole thing can be transacted in the simplest and directest way in the Father's House.

However difficult it may be to find room for the subject in the Church's year of teaching, or to find room for it often enough for the priest to feel that all his flock—probably intermittent church-goers at the best—understand it, it should none the less be impossible for the greater part of a congregation to say that they have never heard of it, or to be wholly ignorant of its procedure. In addition to our sermons, we can use our Church notices (which should be used more than they are for teaching purposes) by announcing occasionally, especially before festivals, when and where Confessions will be heard; and it seems a wise plan to put up in church a permanent notice to say that the parish priest will be in church at regular times for that purpose. Such notices will hardly bring sinners to penitence; but they act as suggestion, and at least they insure that a congregation, however irregular its church-going may be, is not ignorant of the practice of the sacrament in the Church's system; whilst, from a psychological point of view, they will gradually wear down that attitude of hostility in the rustic mind which is always shown to a subject or practice which is unfamiliar or new. As the continual dropping of water will wear a stone, the continual reading or hearing of a notice on the practice of Penance may pave the way for a true penitence when the converting occasion arises.

Again, the parish priest's regular instruction of candidates for Confirmation will give him a magnificent opportunity of

unimpeded and explicit teaching upon the practice and value of sacramental Confession.

Such plain teaching—whether given in pulpit or class—will, of course, arouse opposition, perhaps unpopularity or even malice, for a time. But, after all, this is part of the burden of the priest who is true to his Lord; it is one of the ways in which the servant cannot expect to be above his Master, or the disciple above his Lord. And in time, as the novelty of the teaching wears away, the opposition will die down, and the teaching be accepted as part of the Church's normal doctrine.

Let us take heart, and be certain that the priest's faith in our Lord's purpose for sinners, and his courage in proclaiming it, is bound to bear fruit to God's glory.

Another reason for hopefulness exists in the altered atmosphere created in our villages by the war.

In the first place, the incumbent is no longer in sole charge of parochial money matters; what he thus loses in financial power he may well gain in spiritual influence and in his people's freer fellowship with him.

Secondly, the rustic reticence is fast breaking down—even in religious matters. Religion is no longer spoken of with bated breath, or not spoken of at all. In village life to-day young men freely say—and that to the parson—that they "don't believe in the Bible," or "can't see any good in religion." The old days have gone when rows of labourers, grimly taciturn, lounged each Sunday outside the church door and slouched into their seats as the bell stopped—men from whom no power on earth could have elicited an explicit reason for their Sunday worship. Rustic unbelief has become vocal; and, side by side with this, the rustic church-goer or communicant, if only in self-defence, has become readier to express the faith that is in him. This should make for a greater readiness, or at least less reluctance, in the peasant to unburden himself to the priest.

And this readiness will be helped still further by the fact that social distinctions are quickly lessening, and the gap to-day between the field-labourer and the parson who digs his own garden or pumps his own water is not what it was between peasant and priest twenty and thirty years ago. The country parson of to-day no longer receives the cringing salutes of the labourers or the curtsies of the school-children. What of that? Those marks of respect were seldom for his high office as God's ambassador, but were in honour of his gentle birth or his large rectory or his supposed riches. What if the franker smile has taken the place of the crooked finger of the man or the curtsey of the child? Is not all this to the good? The parson, in losing his place as an aristocrat of the countryside, may win

a higher seat in his humble parishioners' heart and confidence, and be helped toward his true position as a priest.

To some of my readers these psychological considerations may seem but little to the point; but I believe that anyone who has long dwelt amongst country people and pondered their ways and speech will feel that the problem of reaching them is very largely psychological. The mind of the peasant, never easily gauged by the most sympathetic and patient investigator, has certainly not been read hitherto by us University-trained priests who have sought to instruct it.

But the rustic mind *can* be gauged and instructed, though never by the superficial or hasty or unsympathetic pastor. The key to the problem lies largely, as we have seen, in the sphere of pastoral teaching. The villager loves a sermon, and is a good listener; but hitherto he has been largely fed with the chaff of a jejune exegesis, or with exhortations to Christian virtues, when he needed instruction which could convince and lead. The great revivals of religion in France, such as those set on foot by St. Vincent de Paul and Bishop Dupanloup, were spread by waves of eager and sympathetic preaching from the lips of priests who longed to spread the Faith. Patient, eager, undaunted teaching, in pulpit and home and school, can yet bring home Catholic faith and practice to our people, teach the meaning of sacraments and grace, and make it possible that sacramental Confession shall be spoken of, not with upturned eyes or hands of horror, but as a wholesome and simple thing which finds a natural place in the religious life of the countryside.

IV.—Penitence in the Priest.

Lastly, we priests must go deeper than this if we long to kindle penitence in the hearts of our people. *Have we been penitents ourselves?* A devotional writer,* who has studied our Lord's Passion more deeply than most priests, says: "Wherever it (the Passion) has been neglected as an essential in religious life, there spiritual attainment has been poor and ineffectual. . . . We shall find in His Passion the help for all our needs as we advance in spiritual life. In the Sacred Heart of the Crucified we shall find all that bracing sympathy, all that understanding love which we need as we touch one by one the harder details of spiritual life and advance in love—the love that knows no satisfaction, except it be in uniformity to His suffering life. . . . We cannot attain to the knowledge of Divine love except through perpetual repentance."

Perhaps the chief reason for our failure in winning others to

* Jesse Brett, *The Passion.*

the foot of the Cross is that we do not ourselves spend enough time there. God can use only penitents to teach penitence. The communicable flame of penitence passes, not from cold or shallow hearts, but from hearts afire with eager love and gratitude to the Crucified. Have we priests meditated upon the Passion as we should? Or preached it as we should? It will avail little to write sermons on penitence unless we have dipped our pens in the atoning Blood; or to preach them unless our tongues are continually purified by fire from the Heart of Jesus.

G. Lacey May.

DOCTOR JOHNSON AND THE SCOTTISH CHURCH

In the course of the opening paragraphs of Boswell's *Journal of a Tour to the Hebrides with Samuel Johnson*, he writes: "Let my readers then remember that he was a sincere and zealous Christian, of high church of England and monarchical principles, which he would not tamely suffer to be questioned." It is this declaration which, for Churchmen, gives to Boswell's *Journal* and Johnson's own account* of his travels in Scotland an interest that is even greater than the pleasure derived from tracing the movements of the great Doctor amid surroundings so foreign to his usual environment. Johnson was in Scotland for some three months in the autumn of 1773, a time when the troubles of the suffering Episcopal Church in Scotland were not yet ended, a time when the faithful remnant was maintaining its existence in the face of crushing penal laws, which, if they were no longer enforced with vigour, yet remained as an overwhelming hindrance to the recovery of the Church's former strength. When Johnson's enthusiastic loyalty to the Church of England and his deep personal devotion are remembered, it is not surprising that he is found to be faithful to the Church, even in a country where she was oppressed, and where she lacked the dignity of wealth, numbers, and establishment. Where he seems harsh or sarcastic in his criticism of Presbyterianism, it must be recalled that such was his manner. Where he indulges in witticism at the expense of the established religion, it is not his intention to insult. That he respected the learning and appreciated the company of Presbyterian dignitaries, there is evidence throughout Boswell's

* Samuel Johnson, *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland.*

work. His consistent championing of the Scottish Episcopal Church is not directed enviously against the religious body on whom fortune had smiled; it was a vindication of what he believed to be vital principles, it was a defence of truth.

The most striking example of Dr. Johnson's loyalty to the Church was his steadfast refusal to take part in Presbyterian worship. An examination of his own and of Boswell's *Journal* reveals the fact that, whenever on a Sunday he was unable to attend the Anglican service, he contented himself with private reading of the Bible and such theological works as could be found in the house where he was staying. When pressed to go and hear a sermon by the eloquent Dr. William Robertson of Edinburgh, he declared boldly: "I will hear him, if he will get up into a tree and preach; but I will not give a sanction, by my presence, to a Presbyterian assembly." This uncompromising attitude was the cause of much distress to Boswell, especially on the occasion of Johnson's visit to Auchinleck, for he writes, somewhat plaintively (Sunday, November 7, 1773): "My father and I went to publick worship in our parish church, in which I regretted that Dr. Johnson would not join us; for, though we have there no form of prayer, nor magnificent solemnity, yet, as God is worshipped in spirit and in truth, and the same doctrines preached as in the Church of England, my friend would certainly have shewn more liberality, had he attended. I doubt not, however, but he employed his time in private to very good purpose." Another instance of a similar nature is to be found during Johnson's visit to Lady Macleod of Dunvegan, in Skye; while Mr. Beaton, the minister, preached in the dining-room, Dr. Johnson sat in his own room, where Boswell afterwards found him, with Sterne's Sermons, among other books, lying before him.

That Johnson was actuated in this matter by principles rather than by mere obduracy is shown during his stay with Mr. Macaulay, the minister of Calder. Here, contrary to Boswell's own expectations, he joined willingly in the private family prayers, and expressed approval of the extempore devotions of Mr. Grant, the minister of a neighbouring parish. He remarked, however, that he was sorry that the Lord's Prayer had not been introduced.

This conciliatory action on the part of Dr. Johnson is made the more pleasant on account of a sharp difference of opinion which he had had previously with Mr. Macaulay. The minister maintained an attack upon the use of creeds with considerable heat, and Johnson attempted to show that, what his opponent had called an "imposition," was only a voluntary declaration made by all members of the Christian society, a declaration of

agreement in certain articles of faith such as any religious society has the right to demand of those whom it admits to fellowship. Mr. Macaulay remained unmoved by his arguments, and Johnson replied: "Sir, you are a bigot to laxness." He had also been much offended by some slighting remark made by his host concerning the Anglican clergy; on this occasion his retort was prompt and effective: "This is a day of novelties; I have seen old trees in Scotland, and I have heard the English clergy treated with disrespect."*

It will be seen then, that, with Johnson, loyalty to the Episcopalian clergy went side by side with loyalty to the Episcopalian services. At Talisker, in Skye, he had a discussion with Boswell concerning the comparative learning of the Presbyterian and Anglican clergy. Boswell spoke of the assiduity of the former in visiting and privately instructing their parishioners, and observed how much in this they excelled the English parish priests. Johnson grew warm upon the subject, and broke out: "I do not believe your people are better instructed. If they are, it is the blind leading the blind; for your clergy are not instructed themselves." Then, says Boswell, Johnson, thinking he had gone a little too far, checked himself, and added: "When I talk of the ignorance of your clergy, I talk of them as a body; I do not mean that there are not individuals who are learned. I suppose there are such among the clergy in Muscovy. The clergy of England have produced the most valuable books in support of religion, both in theory and practice. What have your clergy done, since you sunk into Presbyterianism? Can you name one book of any value, on a religious subject, written by them? . . . I'll help you. Forbes wrote very well; but I believe he wrote before Episcopacy was quite extinguished. . . . Yes, you have '*Wishart* against *Repentance*.'"† Before leaving this subject, it may be worth while to mention another incident that occurred at Auchinleck during Johnson's visit to Boswell's father. A minister who was dining at the house ended some rather ignorant remarks with a reference to "fat bishops and drowsy deans." Johnson, in great indignation, replied: "Sir, you know no more of our Church than a Hottentot." "I was sorry," says Boswell, "that he brought this upon himself."

It is interesting to follow Johnson's travels up the east coast of Scotland, and to notice his comments on the various

* That Johnson bore no resentment against Mr. Macaulay is proved by his promise to use his influence with Dr. Adams, master of Pembroke College, Oxford, to obtain a servitorship for the minister's son. This promise he fulfilled, but the boy changed his intentions, and did not come into residence.

† A work by Dr. William Wishart, Principal of the College at Edinburgh, in which he warned men against confidence in a death-bed repentance.

Anglican chapels in which he attended public worship. An examination shows that, in every case, both Boswell and Johnson refer to what they call the "English chapel," and some explanation of this may be needed. Under the penal laws the Scottish Episcopal Church was forbidden to have churches, or, indeed, to assemble more than five persons in any one room. But licences were granted to certain chapels in which the chaplains would undertake to pray publicly for the *de facto* king. Such chapels existed primarily to supply the spiritual needs of Englishmen in Scotland, and it was in these that Johnson, as an Englishman, would naturally worship. It is not surprising that they were viewed with dislike by the non-juring Bishops and priests of the Scottish Church, for their own unwavering loyalty to the fallen Stuarts had been the express cause of their oppression. This attitude is so well exemplified by a letter from Boswell to Johnson, which is included in the *Life*, that no apology is needed for the reproduction of a great part of it here.

> On Saturday last, being the 30th of January, I drank coffee and old port, and had solemn conversation with the Reverend Mr. Falconer,* a non-juring bishop, a very learned and worthy man. He gave two toasts, which you will believe I drank with cordiality, Dr. Samuel Johnson and Flora Macdonald. I sat about four hours with him, and it was really as if I had been living in the last century. The Episcopal Church of Scotland, though faithful to the royal house of Stuart, has never accepted of any *congé d'élire* since the Revolution; it is the only true episcopal church in Scotland, as it has its own succession of bishops. For as to the episcopal clergy, who take the oaths to the present government, they indeed follow the rites of the Church of England, but, as Bishop Falconer observed, "they are not Episcopals; for they are under no bishop, as a bishop cannot have authority beyond his diocese." This venerable gentleman did me the honour to dine with me yesterday, and he laid his hands upon the heads of my little ones. . . .
>
> EDINBURGH, *February*, 2, 1779.

We are able to trace four occasions on which Johnson visited the "English chapels"—at Edinburgh, Montrose, Aberdeen, and Inverness. There should be included also his visit to the beautiful private chapel of Rosslyn Castle, which has been the home of Episcopalian worship throughout, without interruption by the penal laws. In Edinburgh, Johnson went on Sunday, August 15, 1773, to the chapel "founded by Lord Chief Baron Smith, for the service of the Church of England." He was accompanied by Dr. William Scott, Sir William Forbes, of Pitsligo, and Boswell himself. The Reverend Mr. Carre, the

* William Falconer (or Falconar), Bishop of Caithness, 1741-1742; Moray, 1742-1777.

senior clergyman, preached, but his voice was so low that Johnson was unable to hear. Boswell regretted this, as Carre was accounted an excellent preacher, and a selection of his sermons was afterwards published by Sir William Forbes. Johnson's stay at Montrose (August 21) was very brief, but he did not omit to visit the Anglican Chapel. The Rev. Mr. Spooner, the priest-in-charge, was absent, but he was conducted thither by Mr. Gleg, a merchant. It is described as "an elegant building, both within and without, . . . situated on a pretty, dry spot, and there is a fine walk to it." The organ was painted in green and gold. Johnson was moved to liberality, and gave a "shilling extraordinary" to the clerk, with the comment that he belonged to "an honest church." It was here that the unfortunate Boswell attempted to rally Johnson on the subject of his faith, reminding him that "episcopals are but dissenters here; they are only tolerated." "Sir," said Johnson, without hesitation, "we are here, as Christians in Turkey."

From Montrose, Johnson passed on to Aberdeen, always a stronghold of the Church. Here, when he attended the morning service, he found a congregation both "numerous and splendid," and an excellent organ well played. One of the Episcopal clergy, who served the chapel,* was a Mr. Riddoch, who had married a cousin of Boswell. Boswell called upon him and considered him "a grave, worthy clergyman." Johnson, however, did not care for him, declaring that he had "no vigour in his talk." Wesley, a year earlier, had admired "the exemplary decency of the congregation. This was the more remarkable," he adds, "because so miserable a reader I never heard before. Listening with all attention I understood but one single word, 'Balak,' in the first lesson, and one more, 'begat,' was all I could possibly distinguish in the second." At Inverness, which was reached on August 28, the "English Chapel" was mean. The altar, we are told, was a bare fir table with a rough stool for kneeling on, covered with a piece of thick sailcloth doubled, by way of cushion. The opinions of our two authorities vary with regard to the congregation, Boswell calling it "small," but Johnson "very decent." Perhaps the two expressions are not mutually exclusive.

Johnson evinced a profound, but melancholy, interest in the ancient ecclesiastical fabrics which had passed into Presbyterian hands, or had been left to fall into decay. Thus, on visiting St. Giles' at Edinburgh, he said to Dr. William Robert-

* This chapel is now the church of St. Paul, Aberdeen. It was built in 1720, and became formally united to the Scottish Episcopal Church in 1841. The incumbent is still required to be in English orders. The "English chapels" were required to be served by priests in English or Irish orders (see Johnson's *Journey*, s. 53).

son, who was acting as his guide: "Come, let me see what was once a church." But the most conspicuous example of this attitude of mind is to be found in his behaviour at St. Andrew's. He had wished especially to see this city, as being the home of the oldest Scottish university, and the Primatial see in the days of the Episcopalian Establishment. The ruins of the cathedral affected him deeply; he remained in silence, and with his hat in his hand, so long as he was within the precincts. Boswell asked casually where John Knox was buried; Johnson exclaimed: "I hope in the high-way. I have been looking at his reformations." Johnson could, however, be generous, for he admitted that the chapel of St. Salvador's College was "the neatest place of worship he had seen." It was in St. Andrew's that the travellers beheld what Boswell calls "a remarkable proof of liberal toleration," in the form of a non-juring priest, "strutting about in his canonicals, with a jolly countenance and a round belly, like a well-fed monk." Others may consider rather that it sheds light on the intensity of the previous persecution.

It remains now to collect a few more isolated incidents that bear on the subject of this article. In two of these the loyalty of Dr. Johnson to the Church is brought out by chance events. He was being rowed over from Skye to Rasay, and passed the island of Scalpa. Turning to Boswell, he proposed that the two of them should buy it, and found a good school and an episcopal church. They would also print as many Gaelic books as they could find. Earlier in the journey Johnson paid a brief visit to the learned eccentric, Lord Monboddo. He was amused to find that Monboddo had a black servant, named Gory, and, on his departure, said to the servant: "Mr. Gory, give me leave to ask you a question: Are you baptized?" Gory told him that he was, and confirmed by the Bishop of Durham. Johnson then gave him a shilling.

To those who know Inverary and its beauties, it is interesting to read of Dr. Johnson dining at the Castle, the home of the Dukes of Argyle, who were then the leaders of the Whig party in Scotland, and staunch Presbyterians. At the present day, the beautiful Episcopal church of All Saints, and its magnificent peal of bells are evidence of a change as complete as it would then have been unexpected. Yet, in the eighteenth century, the Campbells were not without a representative in the hierarchy of the Scottish Church. When the Duchess of Argyle asked Johnson to express his views on the state of man after death, he replied: "Madam, your own relation, Mr. Archibald Campbell, can tell you better about it than I can. He was a bishop of the non-juring communion, and wrote a

book upon the subject."* Johnson gave a full account of this writer, who was consecrated in 1711 at a time when the Scottish Bishops did not preside over dioceses, but were associated together as a college of bishops to maintain the episcopal succession. He became Bishop of Aberdeen from 1721 to 1724, and died in 1744.

It is outside the scope of these notes to treat more fully of Johnson's views on episcopacy as a divine institution, or of his attitude to other articles of the Catholic faith. But Johnson's visit to Iona inevitably draws attention to some remarkable words of his on the monastic life. After speaking of the circumstances that justify a retirement from the world, he says: "I never read of a hermit, but in imagination I kiss his feet; never of a monastery, but I could fall on my knees and kiss the pavement." Such were his feelings when he found himself at Iona, a place that must always be most precious to members of the Scottish Episcopal Church. The account of this visit should be read by all who are interested in the history of what is, perhaps, in many ways, the most glorious branch of the Anglican communion. It contains one of the finest passages in all the writings of Johnson:

"We were now treading that illustrious island which was once the luminary of the Caledonian regions, whence savage clans and roving barbarians derived the benefits of knowledge and the blessings of religion. To abstract the mind from all local emotion would be impossible if it were endeavoured, and would be foolish if it were possible. Whatever withdraws us from the power of our senses; whatever makes the past, the distant, or the future predominate over the present, advances us in the dignity of thinking beings. Far from me and from my friends be such frigid philosophy as may conduct us, indifferent and unmoved, over any ground which has been dignified by wisdom, bravery, or virtue. That man is little to be envied whose patriotism would not gain force upon the plain of Marathon, or whose piety would not grow warmer among the ruins of Iona."

A. B. Burrowes.

* The following conversation on prayers for the departed, recorded by Boswell in the *Life of Samuel Johnson*, is interesting in this connection:

Boswell. Do you think, sir, it is wrong in a man who holds the doctrine of purgatory, to pray for the souls of his deceased friends?

Johnson. Why, no, sir.

Boswell. I have been told that in the liturgy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland there was a form of prayer for the dead.

Johnson. Sir, it is not in the liturgy, which Laud framed for the Episcopal Church of Scotland; if there is a liturgy older than that, I should be glad to see it.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Among this month's contributors, the Rev. A. C. Bouquet, D.D., is Vicar of All Saints, Cambridge, and a former Organizing Secretary of S.P.C.K. The Rev. G. Lacey May is Rector of Easton, Winchester. The Rev. A. B. Burrowes is Fellow and Dean of Pembroke College, Oxford, of which Dr. Johnson was a distinguished *alumnus*.

Mr. Driver concludes this month his series of articles on recent Babylonian discoveries; and those who have followed the comparisons and contrasts which he draws will be able to appraise afresh the unique significance of the Divine revelation to the Hebrews.

We hope next month to begin a series of articles on the Fourth Gospel by Canon Wilfred Richmond, whose book, *The Gospel of the Rejection*, is still one of the most illuminating studies of the Johannine problem.

The Bishop of Goulburn writes:

"In the December number of Theology you printed a note from Dr. Floyer of Esher correcting Mr. Hardy's assignment of the (*a*) poems in *Lyra Apostolica* to Bowden, by quoting from his mother's copy of the 1845 edition a note pencilled by her on the fly-leaf assigning those poems to Isaac Williams.

"I have in my possession a copy of the sixth edition, 1843, which belonged to my predecessor in the rectory of Holt, Norfolk, the Rev. Edward Brumell, Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge. On one fly-leaf is his name, with the date of his purchase of the book (March 10, 1845), when he was still in residence as senior Fellow, and a friend of Hugh James Rose and his brother, Henry John Rose. On another fly-leaf, in his own handwriting, is the following note: (*a*) Bowden, John W.; (*b*) Froude, Hurrell; (*c*) Keble, John; (*d*) Newman, John Henry; (*e*) Wilberforce, Robt. Is.; (*f*) Williams, Isaac.

Canon Lacey writes:

"A pedantically accurate translation of 1 John iv. 20 will produce without any paraphrase the effect at which Dr. Lyttelton is aiming (Theology, p. 113): 'He that is not loving his brother whom he has seen, how can he be loving God whom he has not seen?' I retain the reading *πῶς δύναται;* but the effect is the same if we read *οὐ δύναται.* The fact that he is not loving his brother shows that he is not loving God. Mr. Anson's curious misreading of the English text is probably due to the fact that 'loveth' and 'love' have lost for our ears the *durative* force (as Moulton calls it) of the present tense, so that one is inclined to take 'love' in an aoristic sense, from which there is an easy transition to an implication of futurity; loving God, then, appears to be a *consequence* of loving one's brother."

CORRESPONDENCE

Dear Mr. Editor,

In the February number of Theology (p. 63) you express a desire that the ancient formula, "command these our prayers and supplications by the ministry of thy holy Angel to be brought up into Thy holy Tabernacle," may find a place in the Consecration Prayer of our Revised

Liturgy. It is certainly fitting, as you say, that at this point our thoughts should be uplifted to our Lord's High-Priestly mediation; but I would plead that we should not be bound to this particular phrase. The meaning of it has long been a matter of dispute: who is the Angel? what are the grounds for assigning to any Angel such a function in the offering of the Eucharist? Modern research has provided us with something like an answer to these questions. In Leuken's exhaustive treatise *Michael* (Göttingen, 1898) the history of the phrase, and of the idea underlying it, has been traced from the Jewish Apocalypses, through the Talmud and early Christian writers, down to the "jube haec perferri per manus sancti Angeli tui" of the Roman Canon. No one who studies the material collected by Leuken, and summarized in Dr. Charles's note on Rev. viii. 3, can doubt that the unnamed Angel would have been called Michael in ancient times.

The idea, then, of the Angel's ministry in the heavenly Temple has its origin in Jewish apocalyptic dreams. We cannot be thankful enough that our English Liturgy is free from this questionable creation of the religious fancy, however hallowed by custom and association. We can make use of this, and similar fanciful applications of Scripture, in private if we please; the Church will set no bounds to the freedom of the spirit; but in the solemn utterance of our worship let us exercise reserve, and use only language which we know to be clear and believe to be true. It is enough for us that "with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify" the glorious Name.

Christ Church, Oxford. G. A. Cooke.

[We are grateful to Professor Cooke for drawing attention to this interesting point. But we did not express a desire that the ancient formula in question should find a place in the Consecration Prayer; indeed we were careful to plead, not for the particular phrase, but for *some* clause that would close the Consecration Prayer on the note of our Lord's heavenly Priesthood. We wholly agree with Professor Cooke that a phrase of such ambiguous origin and meaning as this should not be introduced *de novo* into a liturgy.—Ed.]

NOTE: THE GENEALOGIES OF OUR LORD

The last number of the *Zeitschrift für die N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1923, p. 206, contains a brilliant article by G. Kuhn on the Genealogies of our Lord. He has made a startling discovery, which seems to solve a problem generally given up as insoluble. The whole article with its closely-argued proofs deserves careful study; only the conclusions can be given here.

Herr Kuhn begins with Jesus in Luke iii. 29. Who is He? None other than our Lord. Here are two lists current in the family of Mary which have been wrongly combined in different parts of the same genealogy. The resemblances are unmistakable when the lists are written out.

No less than six names correspond. Some of the others are made to correspond by ingenious explanations, one of which is obvious the moment it is pointed out. Maath and Menna are the Hebrew and Aramaic words respectively for "of, from." They are not proper nouns at all, but represent Semitic prepositions.

The names which come between these two lists are shown to be all derived from 1 Chron. iii. 17-24. We would gladly reproduce the arguments, but prefer to send scholars to the original.

Strong confirmation of the main argument is provided by this fact. Matthew has from Abraham to our Lord 3×14 names—*i.e.*, 6×7. Luke

for the same period has 8 × 7. The two extra sevens in Luke are accounted for by the duplication of Jesus to Mattathias.

I.	II.
Jesus.	Jesus.
[Joseph, son-in-law of Heli, inserted later.]	
Heli.	Eliezer [Jorim].
Matthat.	Matthat.
Levi.	Levi.
Melchi.	Symeon.
Jannai.	Judas.
Joseph.	Joseph.
[Mattathias, Amos.]	
Nahum.	Jonam.
Esli.	Eliakim.
Naggai.	Melea.
Maath.	Menna.
Mattathias.	Mattatha.

The genealogy in Luke is that of Mary. The second list omits Joseph. It is far more likely that Joseph was added to list I. to bring in the legal father than that he was omitted from list II.

Another article which deserves attention is a brief study of the *Pericope Adulteræ*. Why did the Scribes and Pharisees walk out when our Lord wrote on the ground? They knew that He was silently quoting Jer. xvii. 13: "O Lord, the hope of Israel, all that forsake Thee shall be ashamed; they that depart from me *shall be written in the earth*, because they have forsaken the Lord, the fountain of living waters" (πηγὴν ζωῆς, *cf.* John vii. 37 *f.* just before). As they accused the woman of unfaithfulness to her spouse, so Jesus by this action accused them of spiritual unfaithfulness to Jehovah.

W. K. L. C.

NOTES ON THE REPORT ON THE MINISTRY OF HEALING

Now that the long-expected Report has been issued to the public, it may be useful to offer a few notes on it, and to draw attention to some constructive principles which it contains. This is, perhaps, the more necessary in view of the varied criticisms with which the Report has been received, though it is to be noted that, as with some algebraical symbols, many of those criticisms cancel each other. Notably the two great organs of medical opinion take diametrically opposite views of the meaning and value of the Report—which, perhaps, means that the principles of interpretation employed are inadequate to cover the whole ground. The Committee were not engaged primarily on the investigation of a scientific thesis, but rather on the investigation of a matter of religious experience or practice. And on the result of their investigations they were not drawing out a scheme, but formulating principles, laying foundations on which it would be possible to build securely in the future.

The terms of reference were: "To consider and report as early as possible upon the use with prayer of the Laying on of Hands, of the Unction of the Sick, and other spiritual means of healing."

While, then, the enquiry was mainly and specially directed to a religious experience, and therefore the answer must be expressed in

terms of that experience, it must of necessity touch on other methods of healing, for "religious" healing is only one among others, though its methods of manifestation seem to place it in a class by itself. What are its relations to those other methods? Does it displace them, does it over-ride them, does it supplement them? These are large questions, and involved a careful examination of those other methods—the medical (material) and the psycho-therapeutic (mental). The first outstanding and positive result to be reached was the conviction that each and every one of these methods was but the channel of a mysterious power which lay behind them all—a power which was given the name of the *vis medicatrix naturae*, "the healing power of Nature." Put that into religious language, and it is the healing power of God. There followed then the fundamental statement of belief (p. 14) that "health, or an orderly condition of body, mind, and spirit, is God's primary will for all His children; and that disease as a specific violation or falling short of this orderly condition is not only to be combated, but to be combated in God's name and as a way of carrying out His will . . . (disease) is in itself an evil."

Two things here are clear, and are a great advance on previous attempts upon the problem:

(*a*) Disease is definitely considered to be an evil, and as not being "God's will" in its primary sense.

(*b*) The old antithesis between "material" and "spiritual" means of healing is dispossessed, for *all* means of healing are regarded as coming from one single source—God.

But while these means of healing come from one source, they operate on different planes or in different spheres—the material, the mental, the spiritual—which, however, react upon each other, because man is a single entity having body, soul (or mind), and spirit. And the centre of this entity is the spirit; so that while each part of man lives and acts and reacts according to its own laws, the spiritual centre is the most fundamental and affects the other parts most directly.

So "spiritual healing" is a reality (p. 13). That is a very great point, and marks a further great advance on former thought, which left spiritual healing on the plane of suggestion only—*i.e.*, on the second of the three great planes on which man moves.

The meaning of spiritual healing is, then, to be looked for and to be prepared for first in the region of the spirit (p. 15). It works outward from the spirit to the body. It is never concerned simply with the body considered by itself, and for this reason it is not to be expected to do what it is the physician's or surgeon's duty to do (p. 18). But there is only one power which can really restore the whole personality of man to its right relation to God, and that is the power which is manifested in the Incarnate Christ, Who in Himself constitutes the union between God and man, and Whose presence and power is guaranteed to the faithful in prayer and sacrament as His own appointed means of help.

The Committee emphasize this need and fact of fellowship with God in Christ (p. 19) as a necessary background to the use of sacramental means, and especially for this reason: it is the only proper ground upon which the use of Unction can be based. To lose sight of it would be to open the door to superstition and to "magical ideas," but having made the point quite clear that the primary aim is "to deepen the sense of fellowship with God secured by Jesus Christ" (p. 19), the Committee go on to suggest (p. 20) the use of Unction or of Laying on of Hands,

or both, as the proper method of spiritual healing. But these sacramental rites (p. 20) are, naturally, not to be used without serious and careful preparation (pp. 19-20) with all the other helps which have been entrusted to the Church.

Here, then, is another point of outstanding importance. The Committee recognize the *rightful* use of Unction, and designate it as one of the great channels of the power of the healing Christ.

But in addition to Unction there is mention of the Laying on of Hands. The first is confined to the clergy, the second is not (p 20). In primitive times this distinction did not always hold (*cf.* Ven. Bede on St. James iv. 15), but since the ninth century (Council of Châlons) it has been absolute in the West. Probably in the English branch of the Church it may be regarded as a delegated ministry from the Bishops, whose commission includes a charge to "heal the sick." But lay persons have charismatic gifts which they exercise as members of the Body (*cf.* 1 Cor. xii.) without any specific authorization. It was this fact (coupled with one other of great importance, of which mention shall be made directly) which led the Committee so strongly to deprecate the licensing of healers. It does not mean (nor did the Committee intend to imply) that there is to be no ministry of healing in the Church. On the contrary, the ministry of healing is so really part of the Church's equipment for her work as the Body of Christ that to advocate a licensing of healers would by implication deny the main premiss of the argument (*cf.* p. 13, § 3). The second fact of which cognizance was taken was that the limitation of the exercise of the healing ministry to a class or caste of people not in Holy Orders (*cf.* letter of Cornelius of Rome to Fabian, A.D. 251) certainly coincided with the beginning of the cessation of the ministry of healing in the whole body of the Church.

It is of the first importance to realize this distinction between a ministry of healing in the Church as a power exercised by her as the Body of Christ and a licensed ministry by individuals. The Report definitely recognizes and provides for the due exercise of the one, and as definitely disallows the other, on the sufficient ground that it is unnecessary (p. 21). The point is, of course, that it is to be considered as part of the ordinary ministration of the Church, and not as the exercise of a particular office within the Church.

There remain two points of special interest to note: (i.) The question of Healing Missions; (ii.) the suggestion of a permanent Committee of clergy, doctors, and psychologists to advise the authorities of the Church on these matters. The footnote on p. 17 sufficiently explains the Committee's attitude towards Healing Missions, but that footnote must be read in the light of the main position of the Report—namely, that the ministry of healing is regarded as part of the normal ministration of the Church rather than as a ground for special public appeal. The caution of the footnote is necessary in view of complicated and as yet unsolved questions connected with crowd psychology, and to sanction methods which might later have to be discountenanced would be a grave mistake. In the writer's view it is possible that a system of "sponsors" might be established which, while it conserved the corporate aspect of the work (an essential matter), would be a guard against too strong a stress upon the emotional element, which is so dangerous. (In this connection Pratt's *Religious Consciousness* may be studied with much profit.)

Lastly, the formation of a permanent Council of clergy, doctors, and

psychologists to advise on these matters is much to be desired. It is unnecessary to urge the obvious need of co-ordinating faith and knowledge, and in this particular part of her work the dynamic force of the Church's faith may touch and transform realms of thought and activity which as yet are only beginning to appear. She has her Star of guidance in the Person of her Lord, her compass of faith set always towards that Star, and she has, too, the Divine afflatus of His Spirit to carry her across the yet uncharted seas of revelation of God's ways with man.

J. R. Pridie.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

Qoheleth (Ecclesiastes) vii. 7.

The usual renderings of this verse, including the A.V. and R.V., Barton, McNeile, etc., hide the lameness or twisted character of the second part of the parallelism which they imply. Thus, to take the A.V. as representative of the rest, we read:

> Surely extortion maketh a wise man foolish;
> And a gift destroyeth the understanding.

There is no lameness of style there. "Gift," the subject of the second half-verse, which corresponds to "extortion" in the first half, stands in its natural place, and completely satisfies the requirements of the parallelism. But the order of words in the original would, on the basis of this translation, run:

> For extortion maketh a wise man foolish;
> And destroyeth the heart a gift.

It is, of course, true that the subject of a sentence like this may stand at the end of the clause in Hebrew, and it is also true that in such a case the agreement in gender between it and the verb may be relaxed (as, *e.g.*, in Isa. xlvii. 11: "And shall come [mas.] upon thee an evil [fem.]." But the point here is the want of stylistic harmony between the two sides of the parallelism, the first half running its straight usual course, and the second being, as it were, turned upside down.

Unless, therefore, Qoheleth be regarded as entirely careless of suitability and harmony of style—a supposition which, one may surmise, no true critic will entertain—the word *mattānah*, gift, must be considered ruled out of the verse.

The rendering of the LXX and Vulgate—*καὶ ἀπόλλυσι τὴν καρδίαν εὐγενείας αὐτοῦ*, et perdet robur (emending *εὐγενείας* into *εὐτονίαν*)* cordis illius—may be regarded as a wholesome revolt against an interpretation which was probably prevalent in early days, and is generally adopted at the present time; but unfortunately the Hebrew form of *māthan*, on which this translation (accepting *εὐτονίαν* or *εὐτονίας* as the true LXX reading) is based, happens to be non-existent.†

There thus remain so far the emendatory readings of Grätz (p. 93) and of Driver (in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*):

Grätz proposed to read *methūnēh*, deliberate, careful, patient (see, *e.g.*, Aboth i. 1: "Be ye deliberate [*mĕthūnīm*]—in judgment"). The

* See McNeile, p. 161; a further alteration in the received text would, of course, have to be supposed, unless the translation be regarded as a free one.

† For the supposed Hebrew form see McNeile, *loc. cit.*

parallelism would in this way become regular, the subject of both parts being *'ōsheq*, oppression or extortion, and the second half running: "And destroyeth the heart of the deliberate"; but realizing that the form expected would be *māthūn*, Grätz was obliged to add that either the final *h* must be crossed out, or that the form with it represents an abstract noun ("the heart of deliberateness"). The excision of the final *h* can, however, hardly be admitted in face of the careful Greek transliteration of the Hebrew word by Symmachus (see again McNeile, *loc. cit.*); nor can the admission into the verse of the elsewhere non-existent abstract form for "deliberateness" be critically allowed.

Driver, apparently following up the idea of Grätz, proposes to read *mĕthūnim* (pl.), the exact form used in Aboth. i. 1. This reading has the merit of a correct Hebrew form, which would lie within the range of the vocabulary employed by Qoheleth; but, like Grätz's emendation, it fails to take account of the testimony of Symmachus in favour of the consonantal correctness of the Masoretic text.

How, then, is the difficulty to be got over? The suggestion now made is that *mathnēh*, a teacher, instructor, doctor of the law, should be read. Both in form and sense such a reading would be satisfactory.* The late Hiph'il form of *tĕnāh*, in the sense of "he taught, or instructed," would again fall within the linguistic range of Qoheleth,† and the parallelism would be as satisfactory as it should be:

> For extortion maketh a wise man foolish,
> And destroyeth the heart of an instructor.

* * * * *

A word may be added to direct attention to the fact that the LXX rendering of *'ōsheq* (*συκοφαντία*, Vulgate "calumnia") is based on the prevalent Syriac sense of the root, the usage in Hebrew being confined to "oppression, extortion." It would, therefore, seem that the LXX translators of Qoheleth lived in a linguistic atmosphere that was favourable to Syriac influence.

G. Margoliouth.

* The testimony of Symmachus can, of course, only refer to the consonants of the word. The vocalization would be his own, or rather represent the then current pronunciation of it.

† The root *tĕnāh* or *tĕnē* is generally regarded as the purely Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew *shānāh*, but it occurs twice in the Book of Judges (v. 11 and xi. 40), in the sense of recounting, celebrating (or mournfully rehearsing in the second passage). The Aramaic Afél form *mathnē* is used in the Talmud in the sense of a teacher of the Mishnah as distinguished from a teacher of the Scriptures—*mĕthannēh* might also be thought of as an emendation, but the form suggested seems to be nearer.

REVIEWS

THE IDEA OF THE HOLY. By Rudolf Otto. Translated by John W. Harvey. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

It is not a usual thing for a work dealing in a severe and difficult style with fundamental problems of religious psychology to run through ten or eleven editions in little more than half a dozen years. This, however, is what has happened to Dr. Otto's *Das Heilige*, now put into an English dress by Mr. Harvey of the University of Birmingham. Resounding as such success is, *Das Heilige* seems to me to deserve it. It is a book that is certain to leave its mark for a very long time to come on the whole treatment of *Religionsphilosophie*, and, indeed, of "primitive psychology" at large, besides containing a very original contribution to Christian theology and Christian devotional practice. I would strongly urge everyone who is interested either in the problems of religion generally or in the Christian doctrine of God or in the life of devotion to buy, beg, or borrow (I had almost added "or steal") the volume at once. Its style is not easy to master—though Mr. Harvey has done his office as translator exceptionally well—and the framework of Kantian philosophical technicalities in which Dr. Otto, as might be expected from a Professor of the University of Marburg, has clothed his thought, may perhaps provide an extra stumbling-block for many of the class of readers, in this country at any rate, most likely to benefit by the ideas of the book. There are probably few to whom it will yield up all its meaning without at least two careful readings, but I can at least promise anyone who attacks the work manfully that he will find his time and trouble well bestowed. Dr. Otto is clearly exceptionally well endowed with the manifold equipment necessary for writing a philosophical treatise on religion. He is at once an excellent analytic psychologist, a man of wide information on the religious practices of men in all ages and all stages of mental development, and an admirable linguist, familiar with the religious literature of India and the Mohammedan East as well as that of the Christian communities of the West. (It is noticeable that in incidental remarks about the vocabulary of our own language he shows himself to have an acquaintance with vernacular English which is really remarkable in even a learned and cultivated writer of a different speech.) Above all, he does not, like so many more facile writers on topics connected with religion, look at his subject from the outside, like a savant who should compose a treatise on the life of sex without ever

having been in love. His whole work is penetrated by a spirit of real and deep devotion; it is a discussion of the attitude of worship and devotion by a man to whom worship is life.

I cannot, in the little space at my command, undertake an elaborate analysis, or even a full description of the contents of the book. It must be enough for me to try very imperfectly to indicate the nature of the writer's main thesis. There are two famous texts on which the whole work might be said to be an illuminating comment. One is the saying of Tersteegen, duly recorded by Dr. Otto himself, that "A God comprehended is no God." The other, which he does not quote, though it may perhaps be more familiar to most readers of THEOLOGY, is the heading of Pascal's so-called "talisman": "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, not of philosophers and savants." The whole argument of *The Idea of the Holy* might not unfairly be described as a profound meditation on the meaning of these two sayings.

The following remarks may be offered as a very inadequate summary. The religious attitude, like the moral or the æsthetic, is strictly "autonomous," a reaction *sui generis* of the human mind to the environment in which it is set. There are experiences, as old as the human race itself, in which we feel ourselves in the presence of something which may be called, inadequately, the "uncanny," a presence which is felt as that of something which is "wholly other," coming from a sphere outside all the familiar setting of our ordinary human life. Like Jacob at Bethel, we are aware of the presence of something which Dr. Otto names the "numinous" (of the analogy of words like *ominous, luminous.*) It is something which at once baffles and attracts, a *mysterium* which is at once *mysterium tremendum* and *mysterium fascinans*, but the really fundamental thing about it is that it is "baffling"; it cannot be adequately understood or described in whatever intellectual categories we may have fashioned for ourselves. Our mingled feeling of dread and rapture in the presence of the overwhelming and unsearchable is the characteristic feeling of the attitude of adoration and the root of all religion. The feeling itself is *sui generis*. We may try to describe it by analogies from the feelings we have in the presence of normal sources of dread or awe or attraction, but the descriptions are all consciously misleading. The genuine sense of adoration is akin to all these more familiar feelings at once and yet something recognizably distinct from them all. In fact, the blunder of the genetic psychologist who tries to "derive" religion from something else, the dread of lonely places, the fear of "ghosts," the purely ethical reverence for a law of conduct, or what not, is precisely that he mistakes for the sense of the presence of the "mystery" some other attitude

which is only partly analogous with it. This attempt to explain away the unique sense of the presence of the "numinous" is the root of the persistent tendency to "rationalize" religion, which, thoroughly carried through, leaves you *nothing* to worship and destroys religion itself. A completely rationalized religion, if such a thing could be, would be one in which God was comfortably analyzed, ticketed and disposed of; it would have lost all sense of the meaning of the Apostle's outbreak about the depth and unsearchableness of the ways of God, and it would be a living religion no more. Where there is living religion, there is always the sense "the Lord is in his Holy temple; let all the earth *keep silence* before Him." (And hence, by the way, the value of a cultus in which ritual and gesture help to keep alive this abiding sense of the reality of the "wholly other.")

Yet there is another element also in religion. In all the higher religions the sense of the "holy" is integrated with all the wealth of the rationalized concepts of ethics and æsthetics. The "holy" God of a spiritual religion is also the perfectly good Being and the "most ancient beauty." More, the integration will take in the whole scheme of our metaphysics. The "holy" God is also the "necessary and self-subsistent Being," the "first Mover," "the Being whose *esse* is also his *essentia*." After all, he is the God of the "savants and philosophers" too. But if he ceases also to be the unsearchable and unfathomable, if he is *only* the God of the "savants," he has ceased to be the living God. We have imitated the theologian of the story who was so occupied with his demonstrations of God's existence that he forgot to say his prayers. In particular, Christianity has presented us with the culmination of the whole process of integration of the rational with the transcendent in its identification of the God who is the *mysterium tremendum* with the human Son of man.

I cannot say adequately how completely I feel in accord with the main thought of Dr. Otto's book, so imperfectly hinted at in the last paragraph. I cannot help feeling that he puts his finger on the central danger of most Protestant "modernism." It will have no deity it cannot understand as the botanist understands a fern or a flower—if he really does understand them—and it ends by leaving us a God who really is only a "magnified and non-natural man," and a Christ who is only an amiable Jewish moralist. Without intending anything of the kind, it "evacuates" the adorable "scandal" of the Cross. Yet without that scandal, what is Christianity but Stoicism sentimentalized? I would particularly commend Dr. Otto's chapter on "The Numinous in the New Testament" for its penetrating and beautiful study of the feature of the "baffling" in the im-

pression made by our Lord on those who were brought into most immediate and daily contact with him. And yet, there is a point where, I confess, Dr. Otto leaves me in perplexity about his meaning. He rightly has a valuable appendix on the New Testament "signs" and is quite sane on the impossibility of eliminating the "supernormal" from the records of our Lord's life. Yet on the greatest "sign" of all he is absolutely silent. He finds the supreme manifestation of the "numinous" in Christ in the Crucifixion, and clearly he is right in seeing that the "numinous" pervades the whole story of that death. But he forgets that to the mind of the disciples the Cross was the prelude to what followed. It was the "resurrection from the dead" by which Christ was "declared to be the Son of God with power." I would submit that no man is free to play fast and loose with the resurrection from the dead. If the "last enemy" has not in actual fact been faced and overcome by man for man, Christianity is not what the world it conquered has taken it to be, and I fear we must respectfully but resolutely turn our backs on it. However fondly we may try to delude ourselves into thinking differently, the endeavour to "attain to the resurrection from the dead" means something more than the cherishing of a pious hope that the Platonic theory of the natural immortality of the soul will turn out to be true. One concluding remark. Dr. Otto rightly insists on the need for *silent* adoration, and proposes to meet it by introducing the Quaker "waiting on God" into the worship of his own Church. *That* is just what some of us want to ensure by the perpetual presence of the Sacrament.

A. E. Taylor.

The Life of Alexander Whyte, D.D. By G. F. Barbour. Hodder and Stoughton. 20s. net.

There are few things which may do more to enlarge our sympathies and brace our wills than the reading of biography, all the more if the subject of it is one whose work has had that effect in his day. The lessons of great lives touch us at very different points, even if we confine ourselves to those of religious leaders alone. The interest of Creighton's life, for example, lies in the astonishing balance of his judgments on matters which are of ever-recurrent importance; of Pusey's or of Tyrrell's in the insight they give us into the hidden issues of religious movements; of Arnold's or Shaftesbury's into the application of Christian principles to the practical problems of education or social reform. But all alike keep their spell over us not as records, but as bonds of friendship. They have left some permanent and treasured impress on our minds and

characters; we turn back to them, not for knowledge only, but for spiritual refreshment: they are a kind of sacrament of the communion of saints. The book before us is no exception to the rule.

Alexander Whyte was born in 1836 in a cottage in Kirriemuir. His parents were never married; and, owing to his father's early migration to America, the boy was brought up entirely by his mother, who earned what she could at the loom or in the harvest-field. Kirriemuir is the "Thrums" of Sir James Barrie's books, and the spiritual background of Whyte's home is provided by that strange sediment of religious conservatism, the "Auld Lichts." Each Sunday he went with his mother to kirk, and was a regular attendant at the Sabbath school; and "on Sunday evenings mother and son would sit together, talking over the services of the day;" while on weekdays, when he could be spared from the fields, he went to one of the local day-schools. At thirteen he was apprenticed to a shoemaker; and it was in these five years that he developed two affections which never left him—for books and for the open air. In June, 1854, he was entered on the communicants' roll; and in the autumn of that year took the first step towards his future career by becoming a teacher at a salary of 7s. a week, walking the four miles each way between home and school every day. A year later a better post opened at Airlie, and Whyte moved there into lodgings with the blacksmith. The minister of Airlie, David White, gave him great encouragement and introduced him to the classics; and Whyte devoted all his spare time to educating himself. In 1858 he gained his ambition and was admitted to King's College, Aberdeen, where he paid his fees from earnings as a teacher, and took his degree in 1862. Then four years followed at New College, Edinburgh, under such teachers as Dr. Rainy and Dr. Marcus Dods. As a student here, and even earlier at Aberdeen, Whyte had taken such part as he could in preaching and revival work, his first sermon at Kirriemuir being long remembered there; and soon after completing his Edinburgh course he entered on his first colleagueship at Glasgow. In 1870 he passed thence to be Dr. Candlish's colleague at Free St. George's, and three years later succeeded to the charge which he was to exercise for over forty years.

It has seemed worth while to record these details, because they give the clue to the secret of Whyte's influence upon the Scotland of his day. His character and vocation were tried in the fire of adversity; and he used this training, through "a thousand minute victories," to gain a rare knowledge of human nature, a steadfastness of purpose, and a power of work and concentration which can rarely have been surpassed in the

Christian Ministry. This aspect of his personality rings out in his Moderator's address, given in 1898:

> We have plenty of time for all our work, did we husband our time and hoard it up aright . . . were we only sufficiently jealous of every man and of everything that comes to steal our time. Did we work as many hours every day and as hard as the people who support us work? As early in the morning, and as late at night, and as hard all the livelong day? Oh, no! We cannot look seriously in one another's faces and say it is want of time. It is want of intention. It is want of determination. It is want of method. It is want of motive. It is want of conscience. It is want of heart. It is want of anything and everything but time" (pp. 284, 285).

What a sermon on Accidie is this! What a comment on the Fourth Commandment!

Many a man is made dour by hardness of life, but not so Alexander Whyte. "We must not only abstain," he says, "but we must make our abstinence genial and full of liberty and delight" (p. 235). And his own personality was such as to commend his precept. His love of knowledge and of beauty, his belief in the imagination, his insistence on the fullest liberty in theological study, these are as outstanding qualities of the man as his industry. To read the list of subjects treated in his classes, which his biographer has wisely published in an Appendix, is an education in itself. Augustine, Dante, Law and the Mystics, Bunyan, Butler, Newman, and classical writers such as Cicero and Seneca—these are a few of the great teachers of mankind who lived again in the mind and work of Alexander Whyte. And this catholicity of literary interest and spiritual sympathy was matched by the wide range of his living acquaintances, from the leaders of Scottish theology such as Robertson Smith or Henry Drummond to Newman, Gladstone, Parker, von Hügel, and Bishop Talbot in England.

As preacher, Dr. Whyte was searching, direct, uncompromising, setting forth "the goodness and severity of God" with all the fervour of a convinced Calvinist. Now he would be speaking of the new nature in Christ, which alone could oust "the indwelling sin"; at another time, he would point the moral with arresting concreteness, as when in a passage on the crown of thorns he said, "I wonder in what sluggard's garden they grew!" His preaching was reinforced by systematic pastoral writing, and by unremitting work with individual souls who needed help. In the larger life of the Free Church he stood boldly by Robertson Smith in the cause of Biblical research; earnestly advocated the Reunion which led to the celebrated judgment for the "Wee Frees" in 1904; and looked forward to that larger Presbyterian union in Scotland

to which Parliament has already been invited to lend a favouring ear.

But of all the activities in which Whyte's versatile genius expended itself, none, perhaps, was so fertile—none, at least, is so interesting to an English reader—as the work with his Young Men's and Young Women's Classes, which engaged him twice a week for five and thirty winters. This work alone would entitle him to be regarded as one of the great educators of his generation. It is often said that Press and cinema have dethroned the pulpit. But nothing could dethrone, because nothing could be a substitute for, the stimulating creativeness of Whyte's lectures, with their vital presentation of each subject, their quick stabs of personal appeal, and the questions dictated at the end for members to study in the week. We do not wonder that Sir James Barrie spoke of Whyte's name as one of "the two great names in Edinburgh" in his student days.

"Il a ôté les épines du Protestantisme." So wrote the Abbé Brémond of Alexander Whyte. Certainly we feel, as we read his Life, that he belonged to the Church Universal. His story has lessons for us all. One cannot help asking whether we in the English Church are not in grave danger of making the way into the Ministry far too easy. Whyte was not alone in his day in proving his vocation by the dauntless faith and work with which he earned his way to enter it; and the result was a depth of character and a width of outlook which provided ideal soil for theological training proper. Once more, if we produced such a man, should we know what to do with him? Whyte was emphatic that one of the secrets of his work was the three months' long vacation which he took each summer, and which he devoted to uninterrupted study and preparation. All honour to the Church which encouraged such specialization! Here and there in the Church of England, in the last fifty years, men have been set free for special intellectual work; but it has seemed to be as much by happy accident as by design. Whyte's life shows us what rich blessing may be conferred on a Church by the exercise of a strategic sense. And, finally, we can feel in Whyte's life the gathering momentum of the Reunion movement. His was one of those prophetic souls which saw that the centrifugal era of Christian history was closing, and that the future lay with the forces of consolidation. He lived at the turn of a tide, which was first felt, perhaps, in Scotland, but is now audible upon every shore of Christendom.

E. G. Selwyn.

NOTICES

THE DESIGN ARGUMENT RECONSIDERED. A discussion between the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, M.A., and Joseph McCabe. London: Watts and Co. 6s.

A frank discussion of religious problems between members of the opposite camps, such as the one put forward in this little volume, should, we believe, be encouraged. "The age has gone by for mutual vituperation," writes Mr. McCabe, and in this spirit he and Mr. Shebbeare enter the lists by presenting their respective points of view in alternate chapters. The discussion opens with Mr. Shebbeare's speech delivered at the Church Congress in 1921, in which a revised version of the Design Argument is defended. "The real defect of the Argument from Design," writes Mr. Shebbeare, "in its popular form is, I think, independent of the Darwinian controversy. It points out that the world appears to conform to certain principles of wisdom, and then argues that if this conformity is not accidental, if the world is really *governed* by these principles, this implies government by a conscious mind. It maintains that 'laws' imply a 'law-giver.' This is a natural but, I think, a fallacious conclusion" (p. 6). The fact, for example, that $2+2=4$ is true for all financial transactions does not imply the postulation of a mind to account for its universal validity; it is as true for the atheist quite as much as for the theist. Consequently, Mr. Shebbeare's method is to concentrate on the concept of *accident* rather than that of design, and he asks the question whether it can be justly considered an *accident* that (*inter alia*) the colour schemes of nature agree with æsthetic principles. Does not our æsthetic taste presuppose an objective standard of beauty? Even if natural selection might be brought in to explain colour, it cannot be cited as an explanation of harmony, much less the harmony of the sunset. Mr. McCabe does not see any design in the colour schemes of nature, "because, first, there is no combination of colours that could occur, and does not; and, secondly, the actual combinations are capable of explanation without reference to any transcendental principle" (p. 134), such as the mellowing conditions of spaciousness and atmosphere, or subjectively by hereditary habituation. Mr. Shebbeare thinks that after taking into consideration Mr. McCabe's explanations, we shall still find in each case a residual phenomenon which indicates the truth of his argument, and we shall be struck with "the number of distinct agencies which have 'conspired' to produce harmony throughout nature" (p. 21). When he puts the question, "Is it chance?" with reference to the principles of morality and the apparent rationality of the universe for science, Mr. Shebbeare then feels that the argument for a "personal God" is irresistible, so that what, under the Design Argument alone, had been conceived impersonally is now regarded in a different manner, and religious convictions press into his mind fast and thick (p. 23).

The book is full of suggestion, and we can heartily recommend it as provocative of fruitful thought. But the old metaphysical problems of transcendence and immanence infect the argument with difficulties. If nature "proceeds to beauty" in accordance with definite laws, as both writers acknowledge, so that it works in and through them, then we reach either an *external designer* who first ordained the laws akin to Kant's

architect of the world standing over against the material in which he works, or, under the influence of evolutionary theories, we reach the idea of an *immanent reason or principle* unfolding itself in the cosmic process. On the one hand we have a teleology not unlike that of Leibniz, which is merely the realization of a programme previously arranged, and, on the other, an immanent intelligence if you like, but in neither case is there room or meaning for a transcendent deity coming into direct contact with the world in the course of the evolutionary process. If we combine the conception of an external designer with an apparently self-subsistent immanent reason, the amalgamation makes the problem of the relation between transcendence and immanence as difficult as ever.

F. Harold Smith.

Is Christian Experience an Illusion? An Essay in the Philosophy of Religion. By H. Balmforth, M.A. S.C.M. 4s. net.

The serious character of the issues for religion raised by the New Psychology has been recognized by those who have tried to keep pace with the ever-increasing volume of literature now being poured out by writers approaching the subject from many and different standpoints. Amidst much of a popular character which has been produced in recent years, and which may safely be ignored as ephemeral and superficial in character, it is a pleasant surprise to light upon this able treatment of a crucial issue which Mr. Balmforth gives us in his essay. Is there, after all, anything of value in religion? Is God a phantom or a reality? Is prayer make-believe? Such questions suggest issues raised afresh by the challenge of the psychologists when they allow themselves to desert their strictly scientific function of descriptive analysis and launch out into highly disputable theories to account for religious experience, and to reveal to us the bases of our prayer life and communion with the Unseen. Mr. Balmforth accepts the challenge, and within the limits of the space available in a popularly written work he succeeds in condensing a cumulative and powerful argument in defence of the theistic hypothesis. We have no hesitation in recommending the book to the close study of all those who are called upon to face the challenge to religion in the light of recent speculation and theories which claim to be based upon the findings of the new science of psychology. It is difficult for the clergy to keep abreast of the numerous books on psychology in its bearing upon religion. Much that has hitherto appeared may be safely neglected, but this work, which is quite easily the best thing yet given to us on the subject by the Christian Student Movement Publication Board, must not be missed, and we hope it will secure a very wide circle of readers, both clerical and lay.

H. Maurice Relton.

Road Mending on the Sacred Way. By J. M. C. Crum. Longmans. 6s.

One of those homely and intimate books which refresh the spirit. You feel as if you had been bathing in pure water on a bright summer day. The subject is the Synoptic Gospels. The Sacred Way is badly torn up by modern difficulties. Mr. Crum tries to mend a short stretch of the road with the help of critical methods. He has written a delightful introduction to the Synoptic problem—the work of a scholar, mystic,

and poet. Shakespeare, Dante, Blake, Dostoevsky, and others are used to illustrate the Gospels. Others have advised students to mark the Gospels with coloured inks. Who but Mr. Crum would frame his advice thus ? " He will provide himself with three pencils of different colours. Perhaps the colours chosen for the Mosaic tabernacle-curtains will offer themselves most readily: blue and purple and scarlet."

Who but Mr. Crum would take a section of " Q " and describe it as " the end of a golden string " which wound into a ball leads you to Heaven's gate ? Two striking illustrations may be quoted. Our Lord describes His yearning over Jerusalem in terms of the hen-house—the hen and chickens. Only Shakespeare of all others has dared this simplicity. " What ! all my pretty chickens and their dam in one fell swoop ?"

The monk Zossima in Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov* prophesied that before long the drunken poor would drink blood instead of wine. " Dostoevsky wrote this in A.D. 1880. It is, I suppose, separated from its fulfilment by the same number of years as separated the Lord's cry of ' O Jerusalem, Jerusalem ' from the day when, where the Body of a dead Jerusalem lay, the Roman Eagles were gathered together."

This is not everyone's book. Matter-of-fact minds may be repelled by it and think it " precious." But we hope sufficient will care for it to reward author and publisher for their trouble.

W. K. L. CLARKE.

BOOK NOTES

Causes of the Present Conflict of Ideals in the Church of England. By R. D. Richardson. Murray. The Modern Churchman's Library. 6s.

This is a very interesting book by a young Modernist divine. He defines the different kinds of authority in religion under four heads—two external, the Church and the Bible, and two internal, which he describes as the Rational Consciousness, which leads to Rationalism in the bad sense of the word, and the Spiritual Consciousness, which is the organ of mysticism and religious experience generally. From his own point of view, he describes the appearance and interaction of these various kinds of authority in the Reformation Settlement of the Church of England, and in the history of the great Church parties. He is rather too much dependent, in this part of the book, on histories of movements and histories of theology. A closer acquaintance with original documents and writers would probably lead to the modification of some of his more sweeping judgments. His conclusion is put in the interesting form that the spirit of Sectarianism appears in those who insist on clinging to the smallest number of religious authorities, while the spirit of Catholicism appears at its best in those members of the English Church who hold fast to all the religious authorities in their due order. For Mr. Richardson, the due order seems to be Spiritual Consciousness, Rational Consciousness, Church, Bible. Our main criticism of this position is that it is not sufficiently free from subjectivism. But we hope that Mr. Richardson will have opportunity to work further along these lines, and we shall look forward with interest to any further writings that he may publish.

Religion and Natural Law. Hulsean Lectures, 1922–1923. By C. F. Russell, M.A. Blackwell. 5s.

These lectures give an account of some of the great Catholic doctrines—God, Providence, Punishment and Forgiveness and Atonement—in terms which the author believes to be acceptable to those who look at things from the scientific point of view. They illustrate Lord Balfour's dictum that philosophy is somewhat prone to patronizing religion, while it very meekly takes its orders from science. There is no attempt to estimate the limitations of the scientific method in general or of particular scientific theories. Mr. Russell has no conception, for example, of the criticism to which the dogma of the uniformity of nature lays itself open so soon as it ceases to be nothing more than a methodological assumption for dealing with inorganic nature, or of the difficulties revealed in evolutionary utilitarianism by any criticism that does not slur over the qualitative difference between "right and "useful." But he has a fine scorn for traditionalism. He shares the complacent Modernist assumption that nobody has learned anything from Copernicus or Darwin except heretics and unbelievers, and spends a great deal of energy flogging dead horses. It would be well if Mr. Russell would find out what is actually taught by living Catholic theologians about the relations between religion and science.

Authority. By T. B. Strong, D.D., Lord Bishop of Ripon. Longmans. Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications, XXVII. 9d.

In a short booklet the Bishop of Ripon shows the important difference between the part which authority plays in the Natural Sciences and Mathematics ("Natural science, at the present time, exercises as wide and coercive an authority in its own region as has ever been exercised in the history of the world; its subjects ask fewer questions and raise fewer objections than any others") and that which it holds in practical life and in religion. The root of the matter is reached when he says "the principle of authority prevails whenever the human or contingent element enters." When this is worked out it makes two things clear: First, Catholic Christianity, which finds the Revelation of God in certain historical happenings, can never do without authority; modernism may do so, for it seeks to cut religious values free from any necessary connection with history. Secondly, authority, rightly understood, does not mean "infallibility." It does not make the Church a substitute for revelation, but a witness to it.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER